DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 369 243 EC 302 974

AUTHOR	Bullock, Lyndal M., Ed.; And Others
TITLE	Monograph on Inclusion: Ensuring Appropriate Services to Children and Youth with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders--1. Highlights from the Working Forum on Inclusion (St. Louis, Missouri, October 1, 1993).
INSTITUTION	Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders.
PUB DATE	94
NOTE	44p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Dr., Reston, VA 22091-1589 (Stock No. D5039; $21.35, members $14.95).
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Advocacy; *Behavior Disorders; Cooperative Planning; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; *Emotional Disturbances; Intervention; *Mainstreaming; *Social Integration
IDENTIFIERS	*Inclusive Schools

ABSTRACT

This proceedings document presents a series of papers critically examining the complex issue of full inclusion of students with emotional or behavioral disorders. It contains presentations by two keynote speakers: "Caring for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders amidst School Reform" (Jo Webber) and "Planning for Inclusion: Program Elements That Support Teachers and Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders" (Sandra Keenan). Highlights from the forum's dialogue groups are then presented in the following papers: "Including Children with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders in General Education Settings: Issues and Practical Strategies" (Tim Lewis and Kathy Bello); "Advocate, Not Abdicate" (L. Juane Heflin and others); "Inclusion of Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders: The Issues, the Barriers, and Possible Solutions" (Eleanor Guetzloe); "Promoting Inclusive Education for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders" (Joseph P. Price); "Welcoming Back Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders into the Least Restrictive Environments" (Sharon A. Maroney); "Eliminating the Confusion about Inclusion: Providing Appropriate Services to Our Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders" (Beverley H. Johns); and "A New Age of Enlightenment in Public Education: Prerequisite for the Successful Inclusion of Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders" (Kevin Callahan). (JDD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 369 243

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
R B Rutherford, Jr.
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders

Monograph on Inclusion: Ensuring Appropriate Services to Children and Youth with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders—I

Highlights from the Working Forum on Inclusion

Sponsored by

Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders

St. Louis, Missouri **October 1, 1993**

Edited by

Lyndal M. Bullock
University of North Texas
Denton, Texas

Robert A. Gable
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia

EC 302974

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders

Monograph on Inclusion: Ensuring Appropriate Services to Children and Youth with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders—I

Highlights from the Working Forum on Inclusion

Sponsored by

Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders

St. Louis, Missouri **October 1, 1993**

Edited by

Lyndal M. Bullock
University of North Texas
Denton, Texas

Robert A. Gable
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia

About the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders (CCBD)

CCBD is an international professional organization committed to promoting and facilitating the education and general welfare of children/youth with behavioral and emotional disorders. CCBD, whose members include educators, parents, mental health personnel, and a variety of other professionals, actively pursues quality educational services and program alternatives for persons with behavioral disorders, advocates for the needs of such children and youth, emphasizes research and professional growth as vehicles for better understanding behavioral disorders, and provides professional support for persons who are involved with and serve children and youth with behavioral disorders.

In advocating for the professionals in the field of behavioral disorders, CCBD (a division of The Council for Exceptional Children) endorses the Standards for Professional Practice and Code of Ethics which was adopted by the Delegate Assembly of The Council for Exceptional Children in 1983.

Other CCBD Products

- **Behavioral Disorders**

  This journal, published quarterly, serves as a means to exchange information and share ideas related to research, empirically tested educational innovations, and issues and concerns relevant to students with behavioral disorders. The journal is free with CCBD membership or is available to nonmembers by subscription.

- **Beyond Behavior**

  This practitioner-oriented journal is published three times annually and focuses on issues faced by direct service providers in the field. The journal is free with CCBD membership or is available to nonmembers by subscription.

- **CCBD Newsletter**

  The newsletter is designed to keep members informed about the organization and its activities and is available to members on a quarterly basis.

- **CCBD Monograph Series:**
  - **Severe Behavior Disorders of Children and Youth**
  - **Programming for Adolescents with Behavioral Disorders**

  This series focuses on current issues, research, and practice relative to autism, delinquency, and behavior problems in the schools.

- **Audio-Tape Series on Inclusion:**
  - **Ensuring Appropriate Services to Children/Youth with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders - I**

  This audiotape series features the keynote speakers at the CCBD Working Forum on Inclusion held in St. Louis, MO, October 1, 1993.

All products are available from The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091, 703-620-3660.

Copyright © 1994 by The Council for Exceptional Children, 1920 Association Drive, Reston, VA 22091.

CONTENTS

Preface / v

Presentations by Keynote Speakers

Caring for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders Amidst School Reform / **1**
Jo Webber

Planning for Inclusion: Program Elements That Support Teachers and Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders / **7**
Sandra Keenan

Highlights from the Dialogue Groups

Including Children with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders in General Education Settings: Issues and Practical Strategies / **11**
Tim Lewis and Kathy Bello

Advocate, Not Abdicate / **17**
L. Juane Heflin, Lynn Boreson, MaryAnn Grossman, Julie Huette, and Judy Ilgen

Inclusion of Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders: The Issues, the Barriers, and Possible Solutions / **21**
Eleanor Guetzloe

Promoting Inclusive Education for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders / **25**
Joseph P. Price

Welcoming Back Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders into the Least Restrictive Environments / **29**
Sharon Maroney

Eliminating the Confusion About Inclusion: Providing Appropriate Services to Our Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders / **33**
Beverley H. Johns

A New Age of Enlightenment in Public Education: Prerequisite for the Successful Inclusion of Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders / **37**
Kevin Callahan

PREFACE

Some Thoughts on Inclusion

Public education is undergoing significant fundamental changes. In schools throughout the country, barriers perceived to separate general and special education are being dismantled in an attempt to change the culture of the schools. The restructuring of general and special education has led to a burgeoning number of students with special needs being placed in general education classrooms and being taught alongside students without disabilities–with varying degrees of success. While there is widespread support for the doctrine of the *least restrictive environment,* some people question whether students with mild to severe disabilities can be viewed as a homogeneous group for general education classroom placement. Like many of our colleagues, we believe there is ample reason to look at educational outcomes for students with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD) separately from other disability categories.

We recognize that some current practices are flawed and that we must correct this situation. At the same time, we must resist any simplistic solutions that may do irreparable harm to students with E/BD by denying them service options in keeping with their needs. Accumulated research has borne out that an appropriate education for some students with E/BD is so complex and intrusive that it mitigates against general education classroom implementation, even with outside supportive services. With the reauthorization of Public Law 94-142, now know as IDEA, school districts are still required to offer a range of service delivery options. Alternative arrangements are necessary for those students who are so disruptive or otherwise demanding of vast amounts of time, energy, and resources of general educators that the instructional needs of nondisabled students would be significantly and negatively impacted. Notwithstanding the growing popularity of "stay-put" programs, we believe it is imperative to preserve a range of service options–from full inclusion to separate classrooms and schools, which research and experience demonstrate can benefit students with E/BD.

Within the evolutionary context of *mainstreaming,* some authorities believe that special education classes are no longer indispensable. We maintain that it would be as inappropriate to fully embrace the current doctrine of full inclusion as to ignore it altogether. Arguably, neither action is in the best interests of all students with E/BD. For some but not all students with E/BD, the successful reintegration into the general education classroom represents a reasonable expectation. Because it is unlikely that education policy will soon shift from the current doctrine of least restrictive environment, questions surrounding the provision of quality services to students with E/BD are uppermost in the minds of many persons. What follows is a series of papers reflecting the sentiments of researchers, teacher educators, administrators, and general and special education teachers, as they critically examine the complex issue of full inclusion of students with E/BD.

Lyndal M. Bullock
Robert A. Gable
Editors

Caring for Students with Emotional and Behavioral Disorders Amidst School Reform

Jo Webber
Southwest Texas State University
San Marcos, TX

Reform, revolution, and change characterize the world today. Some political systems are disintegrating and some are re-integrating. Passive observation of these transformations confirms that change is often accompanied by strife, fanaticism, struggle, and, sometimes, hope and reason. And so it goes in the United States. We elected our current president to bring about domestic change and this change is penetrating our social service and educational agencies. Here, too, change has brought strife, fanaticism, and struggle. The hope is that the current social reform will result in better services for children and youth with disabilities, particularly those with emotional and behavioral disorders. If this is to occur, however, it is essential to proceed reasonably and carefully with reflection, attention to detail, and effective problem solving (Kauffman, 1993).

Social Policy and Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders

Some of the new and proposed social policies directly affects children and youth with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD). President Clinton's proposed health care plan might make mental health treatment available to all Americans, not just those who can afford it. One can only speculate as to what effect that will have on services for young people with or at-risk for E/BD, but it seems to be addressing a significant area of need. Additionally, the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) specially targeted young people with E/BD by providing states with funding to develop and implement a comprehensive system of mental health services known as the Child and Adolescent Service System Program (CAASP; Stroul & Friedman, 1986). To date, 35 states have received such funding.

The Juvenile Justice System, usually a key player *after* students have developed problems, appears ready to take a proactive role. U.S. Attorney General Janet Reno, recognizing that "America would rather build prisons than invest in a child" (MHA/Texas, 1993, p.1) is moving her agency toward preventing crime by intervening with very young children who are at risk. This proactive stance can only enhance what social service and education agencies are already trying to do–empower families and care for children.

Within the Department of Education, progressively more funding has been designated for drug-free schools, dropout prevention programs, and various at-risk populations. The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) has been reauthorized for students with disabilities and the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) is specifically targeting students with E/BD by formulating a national agenda for improving educational outcomes for children and youth with and at risk of developing serious emotional disturbance (Webber, 1993). These young people stand to gain substantially better services if intervention efforts remain coordinated and organized.

State and local education agencies have also been contemplating change and the recent frenzy of restructuring activity in the schools is receiving much attention. The general public and corporate America have become increasingly vocal in their criticism of public schools and opinions about what is wrong and suggestions for fixing the schools abound. The current change process has seemingly pitted parents against educators, educators against each other, and everyone against legislators (Olson, 1993). Funding formulas, goals, curricula, strategies, teacher training, school calendars, and school administrations are in various states of alteration across the country.

The role of special education in the school reform movement remains unclear. Some people think special educators should take a leadership role; others believe special education should take only a support role, but for those of us who care about children and youth with E/BD it needs to be an advocacy role. Caring for students with E/BD amidst the change and restructuring means that we need to guarantee their "right" to the most effective treatment and/or education. This guarantee has to do with informed decision making for each student, with quality educational practices–with accountability and with the availability of a full range of treatment options and choices. Ensuring this guarantee may be the essential work for all of us in the coming years.

Concepts and Terminology

Trying to make sense of current changes in the schools and establishing our role is made more difficult by confusing terminology and concepts. Perhaps some clarification is necessary. In 1975, with the passage of P.L. 94-142 (now known as IDEA), the notion of quality educational programs for students with disabilities was introduced. One section of that legislation mandated that these students be placed in separate classes and schools *only* when their education could not be achieved satisfactorily in general education classrooms, even with special services and aids. This process came to be known as *mainstreaming*.

Special education has been criticized for not adhering to the mainstreaming philosophy. There is evidence to suggest that parallel educational systems have developed, that special education students are predominately served in pull-out programs with different curriculum, that labeling has had a detrimental effect on the students, and that special education costs too much (e.g., Institute on Community Integration, 1991; Rogers, 1993; U. S. News, 1993; TASH, 1993). In fact, among special educators, the term mainstreaming has become somewhat obsolete and indicative of unenlightenment. Interestingly enough, however, the *concept* of mainstreaming is a driving force in general education reform.

A second special education movement came in the late 1980s. The *regular education initiative* (REI) was proposed for students with mild disabilities who were to be merged into general education with adapted curriculum and strategies delivered by well-trained general education teachers (Wang & Walberg, 1988). REI proponents advocated a merger of funding and administrative structures along with strategies such as cooperative learning, consulting-teacher models, peer facilitation, and teacher assistance teams. This merger was described as an expansion of, not supplanting, the continuum of special education services (Trent, 1989).

REI critics, however, pointed out that general education had already failed to successfully educate students with mild disabilities and that research did not support the notion that special education had failed and needed to be changed (Kauffman, 1991). It was also pointed out that some students with mild disabilities achieved better in pull-out programs and that approaching reform purely from a teacher-deficit model was a simplistic answer to a rather complex issue (Trent, 1989).

Building upon the original maxims of mainstreaming and REI, the current special education restructuring movement is known as the *full inclusion* movement. Proponents of full inclusion primarily address the plight of students with mental retardation, particularly those with severe multiple disabilities (Gartner & Lipsky, 1989; Stainback & Stainback, 1991; TASH, 1993). They state, however, that special education has failed for all of its students primarily because of the location in which these students have received instruction and, therefore, all special education students must now be served in general education classrooms. Supporters of full inclusion advocate eliminating individualized education plans (IEPs), labels, and pull-out options so that special education students will have the same choices that we all have. These reformers say that diversity is normal and fully including all special education students into general education classrooms is an issue of morality, acceptance, respect, and coming together as equals (Flynn, 1993). Rather rigid and zealous about their philosophy, many full-inclusion proponents rely on emotional images and generally hostile advocacy techniques to make their points. They appear to be very critical of the "old guard" or those who disagree with them (Kauffman, 1993).

Critics of the full inclusion movement have pointed out that

- Functional curricula and community-based instruction may be sacrificed for students served in general education classrooms.
- Individualized planning may be compromised for this notion of maximum exposure.
- Placement has gained too much importance.
- Historical research has been ignored.
- We cannot speak about all special education students and provide effective individualized instruction.
- The movement is a fanatical one rather than a logical one (Kauffman, 1993).

In response to this aggressive movement, many special education organizations (e.g., The Council for Exceptional Children [CEC], the Council for Children with Behavioral Disorders, the Council of Administrators of Special Education, the Council on Learning Disabilities and the CEC Division on Mental Retarda-

tion and Developmental Disabilities) have prepared position statements supporting the preservation of a full continuum of services, hoping to protect the major tenets of IDEA and to prevent the wholesale dumping of special education students into general education classrooms.

Only recently, however, has full inclusion been criticized by general educators. Albert Shanker, president of the American Federation of Teachers, called for a "moratorium to stop the helter-skelter, even tumultuous rush toward full inclusion" (*Austin American Statesman*, 1993, p. A6). He further stated that placing students who cannot function into an environment that does not help them is a disservice to them and to other students in that classroom. He claimed that school districts see this as a budget-cutting option, that teachers are not adequately trained to cope with the students, and that special services needed by the special education students are no longer available.

While these instances of special education restructuring were conceptualized by special educators, there is also a current move by general educators to restructure special education as it reforms all of education. This movement, known as *inclusion* or the *inclusive schools movement*, has been supported primarily by general education administrators (e.g., National Association of State Boards of Education, 1992; Rogers, 1993) and is seen by many special educators as support for full inclusion.

However, the inclusion movement is much broader in scope and has not advocated the demise of pull-out options nor the inclusion of all students in general education classrooms. Inclusive schools work on the assumption that schools have failed and need to be reconceptualized to own and teach *all* children and to teach to the *whole* child. Not unlike mainstreaming, inclusion "refers to the commitment to educate each child, to the maximum extent appropriate, in the school and classroom he/she would otherwise attend" (Rogers, 1993, p. 1).

This notion is one of many cornerstone concepts of the school reform literature. The inclusive school's literature (e.g., National Association of State Boards of Education, 1992; Olson, 1993; Rogers, 1993) additionally advocates

1. Heterogeneous grouping (side-by-side learning for multiage diverse classes).
2. Bringing support services to the child (including the provision of multiagency support).
3. A personalized approach to educating students (all students get what they need).
4. Outcomes-based education and performance assessment (goals, objectives, and behavioral measurement).
5. A developmental approach (take students where they are and move them unlabeled, ungraded and self-paced where they need to go).
6. Varied curricula (de-emphasizing academics in favor of character development, strategy learning, and critical thinking).
7. Lower student-teacher ratios.
8. Adapted strategies including multimodal presentations, computer-based instruction, cooperative learning, peer tutoring, no-cut athletic policies, team teaching.
9. Team problem solving and decision making, including site-based management and Total Quality Management.

Many of these reform activities have been part of special education since the inception of P. L. 94-142. For years special educators have been attempting to promote school-wide acceptance of special education students while providing effective instructional strategies to students who are challenging to teach. These strategies, based on a combination of developmental, cognitive, and behavioral theories, included individualized instruction, identification of annual outcomes, performance-based assessment, multiage grouping, functional and affective curriculum, lower student-teacher ratios, multimodal presentations, related services, and team decision-making.

It seems that general educators are trying to reform all of education to be more like special education. Unfortunately, the connection between general education reform and special education has not been widely recognized and special education is still seen by many as a failure (*U. S. News*, 1993). Regardless, special educators should be striving to assist general education in their effort to provide "exceptional" education for all students while actively protecting students with disabilities in the process.

School Reform and Students with E/BD

Certainly, the schools have their work cut out for them. Critics of school reform (e.g., Citizens for Excellence in Education) have called heterogeneous grouping, cooperative learning, peer tutoring, and ungraded systems "dumbed-down" learning (Olson, 1993). Behavior modification has been called brainwashing. Whole language strategies are seen as a plot to keep children from learning how to read and write and outcome-based education is seen as a "big brother" move to dictate what students ought to think and believe.

In addition to this formidable opposition, schools are now serving more students with complex problems (e.g., hungry, poor health, abused, unsupervised, suicidal, pregnant, violent, armed, bisexual, on drugs, neurologically impaired). More students have or are at risk for mental illness and more students are in need of social services than ever before (Department of Health and Human Services, 1989). A most challenging subgroup of these students is served by special

education as students with emotional disturbance or behavioral disorders.

Students with E/BD, who are often characterized by attention deficits, immature behavior, anxiety, low academic achievement, social skills deficits, depression, aggression, antisocial behavior, and/or disordered thinking also tend to be poor and come from single-parent families (Knitzer, Steinberg, & Fleisch, 1990). Many of these students are abused or neglected and live in "fragmented" living arrangements. About 42% of students with E/BD drop out of school and many have arrest records. In order to educate students with such complex problems, Knitzer and others (1990) recommended that school programs provide responsive, intensive intervention approaches including

- Access to meaningful mental health services, including crisis intervention, group discussions, consistent behavior management strategies, and intensive case management.
- Strong support structures for their teachers.
- Strong expectations that families will participate in their child's school life facilitated by case managers, school-family liaison personnel or mental health personnel stationed in the classroom.
- High-intensity school-based interventions for sexual and physical abuse and substance abuse.

These authors further recommended a full scope of mental health and educational services to be available to at-risk students (including, but not limited to, general education classrooms, self-contained classrooms, day schools, day treatment, and partial hospitalization programs). Curriculum should not only address behavior management, but also social skills training, academic remediation, self-control, and affective development. Collaborative programs between schools, mental health agencies, and juvenile justice agencies were deemed essential.

Given the characteristics of these students and a view of what is necessary to adequately serve them, it seems ludicrous to assume that *all* students should be placed in general education classrooms as a matter of policy. It seems so ludicrous, in fact, that it is hardly worth discussion. Instead, those of us who care for children and youth with E/BD should review the recommendations put forth for these students and their families (e.g., Knitzer et al., 1990) and work through collaborative efforts to promote a comprehensive system of mental health and educational services. Within the inclusive schools movement, we should support the notion of ownership of these students by all educators, thus reducing the tendency to push them out. At the same time, we need to ensure quality special education services by providing relevant IEPs, pertinent curricula, consistent behavior management, therapeutic crisis intervention, quality instruction, mental health services, a safe environment, and support for administrators and teachers.

Caring for Students with E/BD Amidst Reform

The first step in caring for students with E/BD during this time of change is to accept the role of advocate. This means neither resisting change totally nor being passive in the face of ill-conceived recommendations. Instead, it means being guided by the needs of individual students. Advocates for children and youth with E/BD will be pitted against some special educators who may insist on "dumping" these students into hostile, inadequate situations, and also against some general educators who may want to exclude these students from school altogether. The road will not be easy or clear. Perhaps the following list of suggested actions may act as an advocacy guide and assist with this endeavor.

To advocate for children and youth with E/BD it will be necessary to

- Protect their right to the most effective treatment and education by expanding–not condensing–the range of choices available to these students regarding curriculum, intervention and treatment strategies, services, and placements.
- Protect their right to an individualized team-decision-making process that first inspects a student's needs, prescribes curriculum and strategy adaptations, and only then addresses the best location to obtain an education.
- Resist the move to talk about all special education students needing a particular strategy. Recognizing individual differences ensures the appropriateness of an education.
- Resist being bullied by zealots into losing sight of what is best for each student. Encourage fanatical reformers to practice their own notion of inclusion by accepting diverse viewpoints and refraining from punishing those who disagree with them.
- Keep what has worked in special education and expand it to others who can benefit. Smaller student-teacher ratios, individualized planning and instruction, creative strategies, relevant curricula, skill training, parent involvement, team decision-making, and support services have been found to improve educational outcomes.
- Strengthen special education's empirical base (Kauffman, 1993) and use it to make decisions. Acting purely on emotion and choosing change only for the sake of change can do great damage to students.
- Question those practices that may not work, be willing to change them, and be accountable for

choosing effective teaching practices. Are our identification practices valid? Have we a clear definition for our population? Are we relying too heavily on a curriculum of control and questionable level systems and neglecting sound instruction? Are we using too many dittos and giving too much free time? Have we created reinforcement junkies? Are we reluctant to let go of our students? Are we actively facilitating our students' integration into the larger society? Conducting reviews of instructional practices and the quality of available services can promote continued improvement.

- Prepare students to succeed in general education. Assess the general education setting for necessary behaviors, directly teach those behaviors along with self-control techniques, use behavior management strategies that will transfer easily, train healthy thinking, provide mental health support, and accomplish transition at a reasonable pace.
- Protect students with E/BD in general education settings. These students have traditionally been excluded from school altogether. General educators usually have little tolerance for their behavior and often become angry and frustrated. Trying to reintegrate students who have already failed in general education is more difficult than integrating students (e.g., those with multiple physical disabilities) who have not previously been served by general education.

  Also, protect students from the undue frustration, anxiety, embarrassment, and anger that might result from large student-teacher ratios, fast-paced irrelevant curriculum, failing grades, and outright ridicule and/or rejection. Protect them also from harsher punishments that might be developed if other alternatives become unavailable.
- Commit to professional growth and development so as to be knowledgeable and assertive advocates.
- Promote the ownership of all children in school, the acceptance of people's humanity, the creation of supportive communities, the valuing of cooperation and interdependence. These are noble notions and worthy of consistent attention.
- Work to ensure that a full range of mental health services is available to students with E/BD and their families, preferably in or around the school. This means supporting the CASSP and OSEP agendas, promoting interagency collaboration and case management, and remaining focused on the needs of students and their families.

In Summary

As Kauffman (1993) so aptly stated:

> In a world of rapidly changing social institutions and conventions, special education is being subjected to enormous pressures for change. Special education's future–and the futures of the students who are its primary concern–will largely be determined by responses to these pressures. (p.6)

It seems wise to proceed carefully and gauge the effects of any change on the students for whom we are responsible. It might be necessary to actively resist some recommended changes. Instead, wisdom dictates preserving what is valid about special education, improving areas that have been neglected, and expanding the range of educational and mental health services available to students with E/BD. Change can be exciting and promising, particularly if it is well-planned. Taking care of students with E/BD means advocating, not abdicating; it means being responsible, reflective reformers.

References

Staff. (1993, December 16). Educator: Integration doesn't serve disabled [Interview with Albert Shanker]. *Austin American Statesman*, p. A6.

Department of Health and Human Services. (1989). *Year 2000 National Health Objectives*. Washington, DC: Author.

Flynn, G. (1993, October). *Address by the president of TASH*. Address given at the LBJ Center, Southwest Texas State University, San Marcos, TX.

Gartner, A., & Lipsky, D. K. (1989). *The yoke of special education: How to break it*. Rochester, NY: National Center on Education and the Economy.

Institute on Community Integration, University of Minnesota. (1991). Feature issue on inclusive education. *IMPACT, 4*(3), 1-24.

Kauffman, J. M. (1991). Restructuring in sociopolitical context: Reservations about the effects of current reform proposals on students with disabilities. In J. W. Lloyd, N. N. Singh, & A. C. Repp (Eds.), *The regular education initiative: Alternative perspectives on concepts, issues, and models* (pp. 57-66). Sycamore, IL: Sycamore.

Kauffman, J. M. (1993). How we might achieve the radical reform of special education. *Exceptional Children, 60*, 6-16.

Knitzer, J., Steinberg, Z., & Fleisch, B. (1990). *At the schoolhouse door*. New York: Bank Street College of Education.

MHA/Texas. (1993). Kids in trouble. *Mental Health Advocate, 11*(2), 1.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1992). *Winners all: A call for inclusive schools*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

Olson, L. (1993). Who's afraid of O.B.E? *Education Week, XIII*(15), 25-27.

Rogers, J. (1993, May). The inclusive revolution. *Phi Delta Kappa Research Bulletin*, pp. 1-6.

Stroul, B. A., & Friedman, R. M. (1986). *A system of care for severely emotionally disturbed children and youth*. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Child Development Center CASSP Technical Assistance Center.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1991). A rationale for integration and restructuring: A synopsis. In J. W. Lloyd, N. N. Singh, & A. C. Repp (Eds.), *The regular education initiative: Alternative perspectives on concepts, issues, and models* (pp. 226-239). Sycamore, IL: Sycamore.

Staff. (1993, October). Issue watch: Education reform—Senate subtext is inclusion. *TASH Newsletter,* pp. 10-12.

Trent, S. (1989). Much to do about nothing: A clarification of issues on the Regular Education Initiative. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 22,* 23-25.

Staff. (1993, December 13). Separate and unequal. *U. S. News and World Report,* pp. 46-60.

Webber, J. (1993, August). President's message. *CCBD Newsletter, 2,* 4.

Wang, M. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1988). Four fallacies of segregationism. *Exceptional Children, 55,* 128-137.

This presentation was given as a keynote address for the First General Session of the CCBD Forum on Inclusion, held in St. Louis, MO, October 1, 1993.

Planning for Inclusion: Programs Elements That Support Teachers and Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders

Sandra Keenan
Westerly School District
Westerly, RI

Westerly is a small coastal community located in the Southwestern corner of the state of Rhode Island, approximately an hour from Providence or Hartford. It contains seven villages which cover 33 miles, with an overall population of 21,000. Westerly has four elementary schools, one middle school, and one high school. It has a total school population of approximately 3,300, with additional students in preschools and parochial schools who receive some supportive services. The current special education population is about 600 students. Various programs exist in all schools to meet the different needs of students.

Approximately 55% of students in special education have learning disabilities, 25% a speech or language disorder, and 7% an emotional/behavior disorder (E/BD). It is that 7% who are identified as having an emotional/behavior disorder that will be the focus of this presentation. However, at the outset, I must say that it is very difficult to separate students with E/BD from many others we have in the schools. Almost any education professional today would likely say that for every student identified as having an emotional or behavioral disorder, there are two more with the same behavioral profile. It is only when we begin providing services to students based on needs (and not numbers) that the other "two" receive appropriate services. Given the current status of most municipal budgets, some would argue this position is a costly one.

What follows is an overview of our programs in Westerly and a discussion of some of the strategies found to effectively support inclusion in our schools. It is perhaps best to begin with the assumptions that Westerly's school communities have accepted that

1. All children can learn.
2. All children should be as much a part of their school and class as possible.
3. There was a need for change and the time was right.
4. We should and could do what was right for all students, personnel, and parents.

The goals established 3 years ago were to

1. Gradually over 3 years incorporate change and success that would lead to more inclusive programs (a high priority was students with E/BD).
2. Provide teachers and school personnel with support and resources that would improve the programs.
3. Rebuild trust and communication with students, teachers, administrators, parents, and the community.

Activities That Supported Positive Change

Many activities taking place in the district were influencing change in several areas. For example, there had been district-wide inservice on site-based decision making. Several schools had projects underway and had become accustomed to all staff being presented with new options and taking part in program development decisions. Inservice training, site visits to other schools, and brainstorming sessions had been conducted. We wanted to provide a basic understanding of inclusion and establish some common beliefs among staff, parents, and the community.

Additional inservice training sessions were conducted providing correct information regarding numbers, eligibility categories, and specific profile descriptions of our special needs population. We included administrators, teachers, support staff, and transportation personnel. The goal of these training sessions was not only to provide information but to dispel fear.

Sometimes, assumptions are made that *all* students with IEPs have emotional/behavioral problems or that *all* are developmentally delayed. It is not surprising that given these assumptions, teachers in general education classrooms do not feel adequately prepared to work with special needs students.

Meetings were held with the School Committee and the Parent Advisory Group. We provided them with information and projections of program cost. We had planned for our first supportive program for inclusion of students with E/BD to open in our middle school. There were two students in an out-of-district day program, who were ready for transition to a less restrictive environment, if the appropriate supports were in place to deal with behavioral problems. It was felt by all parties involved that a well planned transition of the students' educational and clinical programs, as well as transitioning of family supports to local agencies would produce successful outcomes. We proposed establishing a full-time behavior specialist position at the middle school–someone with school certification and 3- to 5-years experience in behavior management programs. The overall initial cost of the proposed program would show a net savings to the district of $20,000. The school committee and advisory group both gave their support.

There should be no misunderstanding regarding this plan. If a district undertakes inclusive programs to save money, it will not necessarily happen. In this particular case, there was an initial savings. However, as the program expanded and began to meet the social, emotional, and behavioral needs of many students, regardless of special education eligibility, the cost of operation increased. It is difficult to estimate the ultimate cost, if this preventative as well as reactive program were not in place. Therefore, it should not be solely a dialogue on dollars.

During this time of program development, there were several other inclusive programs beginning in our schools. For example, we had an integrated preschool program, a 230-day primary program, and a transition primary program in two of our elementary schools. These programs began to receive positive attention from the press, parent groups, visiting teams from other schools and districts, and representatives from the State Department of Education. As a result, school personnel became more positive and receptive and less fearful regarding inclusion of all special populations.

Collaborative teaching or team teaching was another area of training. In 1990-1991, we began two collaborative teams. The inservice training continued and in 1991-1992, we had 10 teams. In 1992-1993, we had 40 teams and currently there are 45 teams in the district. The number of self-contained classes (historically classes where students are completely separate all day) have decreased from 13 to 2. There are students with moderate to severe disabilities, who are being served in more inclusive ways. For example, every student in K-12 has a general education homeroom, and each student is part of a social unit in that class, with our goal being to gradually increase the time spent as part of that unit, as well as appropriately meeting the student's educational needs.

Some other changes began to take place for our teaching staff as well. They became part of a social unit and felt included. The staff participated in many planning sessions to develop the models and continued to meet to refine and develop each team's unique program. At our middle school, each grade level was divided by number, not severity of need. For example, if there were 40 students in grade 5 with individual education plans (IEPs), they were mixed heterogeneously and divided between two service providers, each with 20. We applied for waivers from our State Department of Education, so we could use resource or self-contained teachers with either group. The teacher and the 20 students were assigned to a "pod" or team of 4 fifth-grade teachers. The special service provider divided her or his day among the four classrooms as designated by the IEP needs for those students. Cooperative learning techniques were utilized, which incorporated different teaching styles to accommodate different student learning styles. Some related service providers began to incorporate instruction in the general class as well (e.g., speech therapy).

In the first year of transition services for students with behavioral problems, we conducted many training sessions. The wide-ranging topics included

- Student profiles.
- Functions of behavior.
- Reality therapy.
- Avoiding power and control struggles.
- Crisis intervention.
- Restraint training.

Staff members became involved in the local coordinating council for Children and Adolescent Social Service Program (CASSP), an action which improved relationships with other districts, mental health agencies, and the Department of Children, Youth and Families. Interagency agreements were completed at the state level, which reinforced a "wrap-around" service delivery model. Finally, an advisory group was established for the planning-center program, and quarterly meetings were conducted among representatives from community agencies involved with the children and families serviced by the planning center.

Central Program Support for Students with Behavioral, Emotional and Social Needs

Westerly's elementary schools utilize a consultation arrangement with personnel who consult with classroom teachers in four elementary schools. The middle

school uses a Student Planning Center and Support Services Team, with cooperative services as needed through the community agencies. And the high school has a Student Assistance Center and Support Services Team, with cooperative services through community agencies and an area psychiatric hospital.

The middle school Planning Center was developed for students with E/BD as well as those at-risk. The center is an alternative space within the school which provides students a temporary place to "cool down." The goal of the program is to assist students in learning how to manage and take responsibility for their own behavior, including academic achievement. This building-wide support program is open to any student, regardless of whether he or she is part of special education. Each student participating in the program has an individual behavior plan developed by the Support Services Team, which is comprised of a school psychologist, a school social worker, a behavior specialist, and a school administrator. The team reviews referrals once a week and conducts individual program reviews on a regularly scheduled basis. It is their view that the diverse expertise of the professionals involved with the team have helped to create an academically stimulating and behaviorally sound environment for students at risk.

The high school program's Student Assistance Center and the Support Services Team function much like the middle school model, with the addition of the student assistance counselor, guidance counselor, and a teacher. The goal is to encourage students to take responsibility and be accountable for their actions. However, there are some program differences. For instance, more placement options are built into the high school program (e.g., flexible schedules, partial days, vocational placements, extended days on-site, extended days off-site, short-term day treatment, short-term hospitalization, and on-call status of a psychiatrist). These features allow for more individualization of programs and provide the ability to move to more or lesser restrictive environments with better transitions.

Strategies That Make Inclusion Work

Westerly's program elements that support teachers and students in an inclusive model include

- A shared philosophy underscoring the view that everyone has a responsibility for all students.
- A commitment to curriculum adaptations and instructional modifications.
- Environmental accommodations for individual students.
- Collaboration between general and special educators with time to plan effective programs.
- Behavioral and emotional support for students provided by experienced staff.
- Peer support, peer mediation, and peer tutoring.
- Flexible scheduling.
- A curriculum of integrated social skills instruction.
- Inservice training for all staff to ensure consistent programming.
- Active communication and networking within a team approach.
- Coordinated program between multiple service providers and home.
- Teacher support through access to resources, information, professional development, and coverage for meetings or planning times.
- Program support from the community, school committee, staff, students, and parents.
- Flexible programming with ability to increase or decrease restrictiveness as needed.
- Alternative disciplinary responses and reinforcers.
- Planned transitions.
- Appropriate space and equipment in all facilities.
- Adequate funding through local and state governments, grants, and other resources.

Conclusion

In summary, we are truly fortunate in Westerly to have a very skilled and dedicated staff, a supportive school committee and administration, enthusiastic parents who join in our work as well as our celebrations, and students who welcome and nurture diversity. Our plan is to increase parent involvement; to sponsor workshops for parents, staff and the community in the evenings; to develop more vocational options; to continue with ongoing training and support; and to further refine our elementary-student support services. We believe that we *can* make a difference in our schools and in the lives of our students.

This presentation was given as a keynote address for the third general session of the CCBD Forum on Inclusion, held in St. Louis, MO, October 1, 1993.

Including Children with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders in General Education Settings: Issues and Practical Strategies

Timothy J. Lewis
Kathy Bello
University of Oregon, Eugene

The Meaning of Inclusion: Identifying Issues and Goals

The term *inclusion* within the context of education bears multiple meanings and inferences. At issue is where and how to educate children with special needs in an attempt to meet the least restrictive mandate set forth in the Individuals with Disability Education Act. At present, there does not appear to be a single all encompassing definition that everyone can agree upon.

One common theme is the idea that inclusion should be more than a placement issue, rather it should focus on best practices and the means to deliver these practices effectively (Kauffman, 1993). An additional theme within the best practice literature on inclusive schools is that to be successful the local district or school building must take ownership and develop its own definition and mission statement. In order to craft a definition applicable to all children and schools, educators may wish to keep in mind the following list of key features. Inclusion should

- Provide instruction aimed at specific needs of children in the mainstream.
- Focus on providing specialized services beyond special education settings.
- Focus beyond physical proximity to nondisabled children.
- Foster true reciprocal social relationships.
- Promote generalization of social and academic skills (Feldman, 1991).

Inclusion requires at minimum

- Commitment between general and special education.
- Careful ongoing systematic planning.
- Data-based decisions made on a child-by-child basis.
- Flexibility at multiple levels (Feldman, 1991).

Central to the idea of inclusion is where to deliver instruction to identified children. However, building or district-wide decisions to include *all* children with disabilities may be in violation of identified children's federal and civil rights. Once a child is identified, districts are obligated to follow regulations put forth under P.L. 94-142, since amended as the Individuals with Disability Education Act (IDEA). Several points delineated in IDEA are particularly salient to the practice of inclusion of children with disabilities in general education classrooms. First, IDEA regulations indicate

> Each public agency shall insure that to the maximum extent appropriate, handicapped children, including children in public or private institutions or other care facilities, *are educated with children who are non-disabled* and that special classes, separate schooling or other removal children with disabilities from the regular educational environment *occurs only when the nature or severity of the disability is such that education in regular classes with the use of supplementary aids and services cannot be achieved satisfactorily.* (34 C.F.R. 300.550(b)). [emphasis added]

Clearly, the spirit of the law advocates general education placements for identified children. This is in line with the current inclusion movement as it is broadly defined. However, the regulations outline two other critical mandates when making placement decisions:

> (1) Each public agency shall *insure that a continuum of alternative placements is available* to meet the needs of children with disabilities for special education and related services (34 C.F.R. 300.551(a)) and (2) each public agency shall insure that educational placement of each child with a disability is determined at least annually, is *based on his or her individualized educational program*, and is as close as possible to the child's home (34 C.F.R. 300.552(a). In selecting the least restrictive environment, *consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services* he or she needs (34 C.F.R. 300.552(d)). [emphasis added]

While the spirit of the law is to educate identified children within the general education setting, the law is also clear in recognizing that not all children will benefit from instruction in the general education setting and that all placement decisions should be made by a team of professionals, based on individual child need.

When discussing the placement for children and youth identified as having emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD), particular attention should be paid to the statement that "consideration is given to any potential harmful effect on the child or on the quality of services which he or she needs" (34 C.F.R. 300.552 (d)). The literature indicates that general educators are least tolerant of noncompliant and/or aberrant behavior in their classrooms (e.g., Gersten, Walker, & Darch, 1988) and feel unqualified to deal effectively with behavioral problems (e.g., Safran & Safran, 1988). Intolerance and the inability to effectively deal with behavior problems on the part of the classroom teacher will most likely impact the "quality of services" provided to children and youth with E/BD in general education classrooms under the current service delivery model found in most schools.

Given that (a) placing *all* children and youth with disabilities in general education settings without regard to placement decisions set forth in the individualized educational program (IEP) is in violation of their individual rights and (b) children and youth with E/BD present challenges to general educators that may reduce their chances of success, what goals should be set by advocates of children and youth with E/BD under the current inclusive school reform movement? The following are offered as a limited list generated by the group this chapter's authors worked with at the recent CCBD Forum on Inclusion.

1. Given that schools are willing to place identified children and youth in general education classrooms, we should consider general education as the first placement option and view special education as a mechanism to provide the "supports." This means moving beyond the pervasive practice of placing all children and youth with E/BD in self-contained classrooms with others with E/BD.
2. We need to move away from the idea that placement drives services. Currently, it is easier to provide various direct and related services to children and youth with E/BD placed in self-contained programs. What is needed is a system to implement services as IDEA stipulates, that is, provide services in the placement deemed appropriate, based on each individual's IEP. This, of course, will require a rethinking of how special education operates and ultimately a redefining of job roles.
3. We need to rethink how educators are trained at both the preservice and inservice levels. While general educators have been shown to be least tolerant of, and poorly trained to deal with, problematic behavior, there is evidence that given proper information and training, general educators can effectively teach children and youth with E/BD. This will require training programs to focus on a variety of diverse learners and strategies. At the same time, more emphasis within special education training programs should be placed on understanding the general education curriculum and providing teachers with collaboration and consultation skills.
4. Throughout any school reform movement, the ultimate focus should be on providing the best services based on individual child need. Therefore, an equal focus on improving services across the placement continuum, especially at the secondary level, needs to be incorporated in reform agendas.

Defining Plans to Ensure Appropriate Services to Students with E/BD within Inclusive Environments

The inclusive school movement can provide educators responsible for providing services to children and youth with E/BD a unique opportunity to effect change at two levels. First, reorganizing schools to meet the needs of diverse learners can be the impetus to develop school-wide strategies that meet both the needs of identified children and youth and the needs of children and youth at risk for developing more serious patterns of behavioral problems. Second, most problematic behaviors children and youth with E/BD present require more than one classroom teacher's expertise and time.

By moving toward inclusive practices, teachers of children and youth with E/BD can get other school

personnel involved in these children and youth's individualized education programs, thereby setting the occasion for success across settings.

The remainder of this section outlines key features–at both the system and classroom levels–for developing inclusive schools that take into account the unique challenges presented by children and youth with E/BD.

Key Features of System-Wide Inclusive Schools

The following annotated list includes suggestions from our CCBD Forum working group, a collection of recommendations based on the work of various authorities (Cullinan, Sabornie, & Crossland, 1992; Feldman, 1991; Gable, McLaughlin, Sindelar, & Kilgore, 1993; Goodland & Lovitt, 1993; Lloyd, Keller, Kauffman, & Hallahan, 1988; National Educational Association, 1992; Schloss, 1992; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1992; Wong, Kauffman, & Lloyd, 1991), and practical models (Colvin, Kameenui, & Sugai, in press; Dickey, Jaco, Williams, Sager, & Slay, 1983; Smith & Smith, 1985).

- Mission Statement. School districts and/or buildings should draft mission statements that reflect their commitment to educating children and youth in inclusive environments that *everyone* in the building will support.
- Redefinition of Roles. Providing traditional special education services in the mainstream will require shifting responsibilities on the part of general and special educators. Administrative support to redefine these roles is essential.
- Ongoing Assessment. Formative data collection strategies should be developed and implemented to ensure that all children and youth are benefiting from instruction across settings.
- Consultation and Collaboration. Inclusive practices will require that all building personnel work together. Do not assume everyone is fluent in collaboration and consultation skills simply because they have expertise in a particular area. Training to work as a team should be provided.
- Discipline Policy Amendments. Most traditional school discipline policies stipulate infractions and accompanying punitive consequences. Ideally, a new discipline policy should be drafted–one which focuses on prosocial behavior and mechanisms to teach and reinforce compliance.
- Involving Parents. Given support services provided directly in the mainstream, 76% of surveyed parents indicated they would be in favor of integrating their children and youth with disabilities in general education settings. However, if no additional supports were to be provided, only 25% of parents surveyed indicated they would be in favor of mainstreaming their child (Simpson & Myles, 1989).

The development and implementation of these key features are best accomplished by a building-level team. The composition of the team should be such that all areas of the building staff are represented (e.g., grade-level educators, special educators, counselors, educational assistants). The team should also develop (a) an established ongoing meeting time, (b) established ongoing access to entire building staff, and (c) a mechanism to access outside expertise. The major tasks the building team should address include

- Designing a system around the school's mission.
- Modifying schedules to provide services where needed.
- Creating new job descriptions to reflect changes.
- Supervising and assisting all staff.
- Providing all staff with *ongoing* site-based training based on best practice.

Key to sustaining the team and ensuring that training and other recommendations are implemented is administrative support (Roach, 1993). Administrative support can take several forms including the provision of release time, credit, money, letters in file, reduced class size, and clerical assistance.

Key Features of Inclusive Classrooms

In order for children and youth with E/BD to benefit from instruction in general education classrooms, the following list of effective practices based on suggestions from our group, the literature (Cullinan et al., 1992; Feldman, 1991; Gable et al., 1993; Goodland & Lovitt, 1993; Lloyd, Keller, Kauffman, Hallahan, 1988; National Educational Association, 1992; Schloss, 1992; Scruggs & Mastropieri, 1992; Wong et al., 1991), practical models (Colvin et al., in press; Dickey et al., 1983; Smith & Smith, 1985) should be taken into account.

- The teacher provides high rates of engagement time with the curriculum.
- The teacher provides instructional sequences that include demonstrations, guided practice, independent practice, and review/reteaching.
- The teacher expects students to be accountable for themselves.
- The teacher expects and promotes high rates of student success (80% or higher).
- The teacher provides low rates of criticism and instead provides informative, behavioral-specific feedback.
- There are positive, publicly stated classroom rules that are taught and enforced.
- The teacher employs preventative behavior management strategies.
- Formative data-based decisions are made regarding student progress.

- There are predictable classroom routines.
- The teacher is confident in his or her ability to help students learn and behave appropriately.
- The teacher displays a favorable attitude toward integrating children and youth with disabilities.
- The teacher employs a variety of teaching strategies.

Effective teaching practices reduce the likelihood of minor behavior problems occurring but are not sufficient to meet all the needs of children and youth with E/BD. Direct instruction in the area of social skills and individual behavior change programs will still be a necessary component of the educational program of children and youth with E/BD. Current recommended strategies to implement needed behavioral interventions in general education settings include team teaching and peer tutoring.

Team teaching requires the special and general educator to share *all* teaching responsibilities in classes where students with E/BD are placed (Alper & Ryndak, 1992). Practitioners report that it is important to the success of the program that both teachers are viewed as course instructors by the students. This will avoid singling out the identified student and provide specialized instruction for nonidentified children/youth who are at risk. Team teaching also provides the specialist an opportunity to implement and monitor behavior change plans directly in targeted settings (Bilken & Zollers, 1986).

Peer tutoring pairs socially competent students with children and youth with E/BD in an attempt to achieve two key outcomes. First, the student with E/BD has the opportunity to receive one-on-one instruction in situations where the classroom teacher may not have time. Second, it is hoped that the skilled student will be viewed as a model by the student with E/BD and provide an appropriate example of prosocial responding in the classroom (Scruggs, Mastropieri, & Richter, 1985). Peer tutors can also serve as mediators to the target child in promoting maintenance and generalization of behavior change by directly promoting and reinforcing prosocial behavior (Mathur & Rutherford, 1991).

Moving Toward Ideal Educational Placements for Students with E/BD: Overcoming Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal

Any attempt to change current service delivery systems is likely to meet with challenges. Current obstacles can be identified at two broad levels–theoretical and practical. At a theoretical level are two major issues: (a) the majority of the current literature focuses primarily on academic outcomes within inclusion models and (b) the inclusion movement itself originated with advocates for students with severe disabilities and learning disabilities. Given the limited database on outcomes of inclusion and its current population focus, the generalizability to children and youth with E/BD is tenuous, at best (Braaten, Kauffman, Braaten, Polsgrove, & Nelson, 1988; Davis, 1989).

At a practical level, the issue of including children and youth with E/BD in general education classrooms faces numerous challenges. It has been well documented that teacher attitudes can influence the success or failure of any program and yet, research has demonstrated that teachers highly value social competence and compliance to teacher directions (Gersten, Walker, & Darch, 1988), two behavioral patterns students with E/BD often fail to demonstrate. Peer attitudes are equally important but once again, research has shown that individuals who display inappropriate social behaviors have the highest peer rejection rates (Sabornie, 1991). The attitude of students with E/BD can also impact the success of their integration. A child or youth not adequately prepared for the mainstream and/or not provided needed support can quickly regress. Furthermore, lack of administrative support will greatly impede any efforts to include children and youth with E/BD in general education classrooms.

At issue with all theoretical and practical barriers is the need for effective, empirically validated practices and training. For example, while teachers typically hold unfavorable attitudes about educating students who present challenging behaviors in the classroom, providing the teacher with information and training can positively impact their views. In their executive summary of a national forum on inclusion, the National Education Association (1992) recommended that in order

> to create and maintain high quality outcomes, the school integration effort must be fully financed, piloted, and evaluated on a controlled basis before system wide, statewide, or national implementation. (p. 7)

The question arises: Do we as advocates of children and youth with E/BD wait for the funding and database to emerge or do we place ourselves within the current movement to ensure successful outcomes for children and youth with E/BD?

As stated earlier, the inclusion movement presents an opportunity to integrate children and youth who historically have been one of the most difficult groups to place in general education settings. Validated behavior change technology, social skill instruction, and effective teaching practices are available to meet the needs of children and youth with E/BD. A systematic implementation of available technology across settings, coupled with a rethinking of how services are delivered, will be a necessary component of any movement to include student with E/BD in general educa-

Mission Statement

Solicit input from *all* staff and develop measurable, achievable objectives based on statement.

Integration Team

Tasks	*Procedures*
• Develop plan.	• Develop working structures.
• Target training needs.	• Maintain regular meeting time.
• Develop progress monitoring.	• Secure regular access to building staff.
• Examine current curriculum.	• Deliver effective behavioral support strategies.
• Evaluate appropriate teachers and placements.	• Involve parents.
• Oversee implementation .	• Implement ongoing inservice training.
• Disseminate plan to all stake holders	

Administrative Support

• Provide release time. • Redefine job descriptions. • Set the "tone."

Figure 1. System-Level Inclusion Working Plan.

tion settings. The idea that services commonly provided to children and youth with E/BD can only be implemented in a segregated special education setting needs to be eliminated and supplanted by the idea that the services follow the child.

Imagine a student with E/BD making his/her way through the school day as a "nonidentified" child or youth. Think of all the environmental and social variables that individual would encounter. The critical question then becomes: Given this child's unique and individual needs, how do we implement services in each of the daily environments that the individual encounters taking into account all relevant academic and social variables? Because the law stipulates that the answer to this question is based on individual need, there cannot be a single all inclusive answer. However, there can be an established process to determine individual need and to decide how to implement services across educational environments. In addition, the process can determine needed training, time allotment, costs, personnel, and other factors necessary to implement individual plans.

Figure I provides a working model with key points to address in the development of system-wide practices that include children and youth with challenging behaviors. One salient feature of the figure is the lack of clear "how-to" directions. If inclusion of children and youth with E/BD is to truly be successful, then it is necessary to generate strategies based on each district's current student, staff, and administrative needs.

References

Alper, S., & Ryndak, D. L. (1992). Educating students with severe handicaps in regular classes. *The Elementary School Journal, 92,* 373-387.

Bilken, D., & Zollers, N. (1986). The focus of advocacy in the LD field. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 19,* 579-586.

Braaten, S., Kauffman, J. M., Braaten, B., Polsgrove, L., & Nelson, C. M. (1988). The regular education initiative: Patent medicine for behavioral disorders. *Exceptional Children, 54,* 21-27.

Colvin, G., Kameenui, E. J., & Sugai, G. (in press). Reconceptualizing behavior management and school-wide discipline in general education. *Education and Treatment of Children.*

Cullinan, D., Sabornie, E. J., & Crossland, C. L. (1992). Social mainstreaming of mildly handicapped students. *The Elementary School Journal, 92,* 339-351.

Davis, W. E. (1989). The regular education initiative debate: Its promises and problems. *Exceptional Children, 55,* 440-447.

Dickey, L., Jaco, L., Williams, M., Sager, N., & Slay, T. (1983). A systematic follow-up approach for

mainstreaming students with behavior and emotional disorders. *The Exceptional Child, 30,* 185-189.

Feldman, E. (1991). *Guidelines regarding integration of students with identified special education needs.* Boston: Boston Public Schools. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 300 990)

Gable, R. A., McLaughlin, V. L., Sindelar, P., & Kilgore, K. (1993). Unifying general and special education teacher preparation: Some cautions along the road to educational reform. *Preventing School Failure, 37,* 5-10.

Gersten, R., Walker, H., & Darch, C. (1988). Relationship between teachers' effectiveness and their tolerance for handicapped students. *Exceptional Children, 54,* 433-438.

Goodland, J. I., & Lovitt, T. C. (Eds.) (1993). *Integrating general and special education.* New York: Merrill.

Kauffman, J. M. (1993). How we might achieve the radical reform of special education. *Exceptional Children, 60,* 6-16.

Lloyd, J. W., Keller, C. E., Kauffman, J. M., & Hallahan, D. P. (1988). *What will the regular education initiative require of general education teachers?* Washington, DC: Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education.

Mathur, S. R., & Rutherford, R. B. (1991). Peer-mediated interventions promoting skills of children and youth with behavioral disorders. *Education and Treatment of Children, 14,* 227-242.

National Education Association. (1992). *Integrating students with special needs: Policies and practices that work.* Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 301 739).

Roach, V. (1993, October). *Winners all: A call for inclusive schools.* Colloquium presented at the University of Oregon, Eugene, Oregon.

Sabornie, E. J. (1991). Measuring and teaching social skills in the mainstream. In G. Stoner, M. R. Shinn, & H. M. Walker (Eds.), *Interventions for achievement and behavior problems* (pp. 161-177). Silver Spring, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Safran, S. P., & Safran, J. S. (1988). Perceptions of problem behaviors: A review an analysis of research. In R. B. Rutherford, C. M. Nelson, & S. R. Forness (Eds.), *Bases of severe behavioral disorders in children and youth* (pp. 132-138). Boston: College-Hill Press.

Schloss, P. J. (1992). Mainstreaming revisited. *The Elementary School Journal, 92,* 233-244.

Scruggs, T. E., & Mastropieri, M. A. (1992). Effective mainstreaming strategies for mildly handicapped students. *The Elementary School Journal, 92,* 389-409.

Scruggs, T. E., Mastropieri, M. A., & Richter, L. (1985). Peer tutoring with behaviorally disordered students: Social and academic benefits. *Behavioral Disorders, 10,* 283-294.

Simpson, R. L., & Myles, B. S. (1989). Parent's mainstreaming modification preferences for children with educable mental handicaps, behavior disorders, and learning disabilities. *Psychology in the Schools, 26,* 292-301.

Smith, G., & Smith, D. (1985). A mainstreaming program that really works. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 18,* 369-372.

Wong, K. L. H., Kauffman, J. M., & Lloyd, J. W. (1991). Choices for integration: Selecting teachers for mainstreamed students with emotional or behavioral disorders. *Intervention in School and Clinic, 27,* 108-115.

Advocate, Not Abdicate

L. Juane Heflin
Open Door Intergenerational Center, Austin, TX

Lynn Boreson
Department of Public Instruction, Madison, WI

MaryAnn Grossman
Columbus Public Schools, Columbus, OH

Julie Huette
Schalmont Central School District, Schenectady, NY

Judy Ilgen
LaSalle County Educational Allicance for Special Education
Streator, IL

Reflecting the diversity of the population of children and youth with challenging behaviors, a group of professionals which included teachers, administrators, inclusion program coordinators, consultants, university professors, special education process coordinators, and psychologists met to discuss the problems and promise of the national trend toward full inclusion. The setting was one of the working groups of the CCBD Forum on Inclusion. Initial discussion among this group revealed that inclusionary practices were being implemented very differently in the 11 states represented. A synopsis of the practices in several of the states provided a starting point from which to deliberate the issue.

The group abandoned attempts at defining *full inclusion* and instead came to a consensus on a programming goal for students with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD). Obstacles preventing the achievement of the goal were delineated and strategies discussed to overcome the obstacles. This paper summarizes one group's efforts to ensure appropriate services for children with E/BD during a time when the national trend is to overlook their special needs in favor of combining and consolidating students for philosophical rather than rational reasons.

The Meaning of Inclusion: Identifying Issues and Goals

In addition to perspectives stemming from the practices of different states, our group provided perspectives originating from the viewpoints of the different professional disciplines represented. Although different approaches are being taken toward providing services in the regular classroom, several themes were recurrent. These themes are summarized as follows:

- Class Within a Class. Team teaching in which students with E/BD are brought into a regular class with their own teacher for instruction.
- Content Mastery. Both pre- and postreferral options were mentioned. The prereferral model allows for assistance in another room available for any student; whereas, the postreferral model provides for special assistance only if the student has received the label of special education.
- Exclusionary Inclusion. A commonly mentioned practice consisted of "dumping" students with E/BD back into regular classes without support, so that they were physically included, but for all practical purposes excluded due to attitudinal barriers and the increased amounts of time that the student spent in disciplinary removals.

- Physical Proximity Without Academic Gains. Some students with E/BD are being placed in general education classrooms and allowed to "do their own thing," so that as long as they do not disrupt the environment, they are simply left alone.
- Increased Resource Placements. In some places there is a surge in the number of students being served in resource rooms rather than being referred for self-contained placement.
- Reactions to Parents. In many states students with E/BD are being included in regular class environments if their parents insist. Otherwise, inclusionary practices are not being promoted.
- Attitudes of *us* versus *them*. Professionals in regular education are sometimes reluctant to take the responsibility of working with a student with E/BD. Likewise, professionals in special education are at times unwilling to relinquish their ownership for the students with special needs.

Participants from some states shared refreshing practices which contrasted to the bleak outlook on programs for students with E/BD presented by others in the group. In one state, interventions for students with E/BD are seen as a *service* and not a *place* so that inclusion is more readily accomplished. Services vary by building and are highly responsive to parental demands. Another state has developed a 3-year initiative in which professionals are being systematically trained to meet the needs of children and youth with E/BD. Another provides a top-down approach by specializing instruction for preservice teachers at the university level, having the state match district expenditures which specifically promote inclusionary practices, and providing for preplanning and preparation on a state-level for inclusive classrooms.

Defining Plans to Ensure Appropriate Services to Students with E/BD within Inclusive Environments

From the awareness of the diversity of practices intended to promote inclusive environments came a resolve to define what should be happening for students with E/BD. The group delineated this resolve in the form of a goal statement. The goal can be accomplished if the components of collaboration, awareness, and curriculum are addressed. The statement reads:

> *Educational and programming decisions for students with E/BD should be based on the needs of the individual student, utilizing a menu of service options, with the general education environment being the first option considered.*

Inclusionary practices will occur naturally through the collaboration of general and special education. The two systems will need to work together as one to guarantee behavioral and academic learning for students with E/BD. Collaboration between the two professional disciplines, which have a long history of operating as segregated systems, will occur only with focused effort. This fact has implications for the professional foundations of teacher training. Once the training foundations for collaboration have been ingrained, teachers must continue to dialogue with each other regarding the needs of *all* students and any necessary changes in practice. This latter condition presents a particular challenge in the instances of students with E/BD. It is our experience that school districts will benefit by providing specific, regularly scheduled, protected time for professionals to interact and discuss individual student programs.

It is important for everyone involved in education–teachers, administrators, professionals in related fields such as school counseling, students, and parents–to have an awareness of diversity and acceptance of differences. This can be particularly difficult in the case of students with E/BD: Students with sensory impairments, mental impairments, or orthopedic impairments may be struggling to gain initial access to an inclusive environment in a general education classroom whereas it is likely that students with E/BD were once in the general education classroom and were so disruptive that they were subjected to "refer-and-remove" practices, to the point of exclusion. This fact creates a situation in which general education teachers, students, and parents are more wary than they are uninformed of the student's special needs. In promoting inclusion for students with more obvious impairments, awareness training generally consists of providing information to facilitate understanding. In promoting the inclusion of students with E/BD, however, that training will need to consist of persuading the general education setting to reaccept the student into that environment.

Sensitivity training must be provided for all parties who could be affected by the inclusion of students with E/BD and presented in such a way that it can be fully understood. Thus, students in general education will need age-appropriate, interactive discussions covering what they can expect and what they can do to promote success for students with E/BD as well as their own. Parents of students in general education should be given information which helps them relate to the student with challenging behaviors as if that child were their own. They can then reinforce the efforts of the general education students. Parents of children with challenging behaviors need to be made to feel a part of the system while maintaining realistic expectations and a sense of optimism.

Teachers must also be made aware of the feasibility of success in working with a student with E/BD. Teachers are typically an autonomous lot, each pre-

ferring to be the sole authority within the confines of his or her classroom. Awareness training for teachers will include empowering them to work with students with challenging behaviors. In addition, teachers will need training to work as team members in various collaborative arrangements, which will allow them to transcend the physical boundaries of their own classrooms. Psychologically, teachers need to be encouraged to "buy into" the philosophy of inclusion.

Educational programs will allow for the success of inclusionary environments if a shift is made from content-focused programs to student-centered programs. The overall goal of educational systems is to develop individuals who can maximize their personal potential within the role of a contributing citizen. A contributing-citizen outcome has implications for social and behavioral curricula as well as academic ones. Rather than weight educational programming with narrowly defined content/knowledge acquisition, school systems should use specific observations to determine student capabilities and develop programming which is student centered. The identification of student capabilities should not be used to impose limits on student opportunity, but rather to create a starting place for instruction and an outline for progression.

Moving Toward Ideal Educational Placements for Students with E/BD: Overcoming Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal

A number of obstacles inhibiting the attainment of the goal statement developed by this group were identified. Barriers were categorized according to their temporal relationship to inclusive programming for students with E/BD. Prior to successful inclusive programming, training will need to occur with preservice and inservice teachers as well as with significant others (i.e., administrators, school boards, parents, and students). The ongoing challenge during the implementation phase of inclusive programming will be to maintain the momentum of collaboration through regular communication. We feel that the use of labels is both a barrier and a facilitator, and they need to be used more effectively so as to be less stigmatizing.

Although there are other barriers to achieving the ideal, the group focused on the ones already mentioned. Next, we developed specific suggestions to help remove the barriers. Some ways to overcome barriers relate to both teacher training and training of significant others:

- Identify existing lists of common competencies for general and special education teachers (e.g., "Model Standards for Beginning Teacher Licensing and Development: A Resource for State Dialogue," available from the Council of Chief State School Officers).
- Make certain that the "right" people are aware of these lists (e.g., teacher trainers and state education agency personnel).
- Set up a mentoring system or some other type of resource system for teachers.
- Provide more practical, hands-on experience in preservice programs and be certain to link theory to practice.
- Arrange for institutions of higher education to hold seminars on effective practices to keep people in the field up to date. This could be done at the preservice level as part of the discussion sessions held concurrently with student teaching. At the inservice level, evening or weekend seminars (not necessarily for credit) could be developed.
- Provide more public relations training for teachers (e.g., how to "sell" to parents, other staff).
- Refine "people skills." A collaborative model is not going to work if people cannot work together!
- Develop a format that would allow professionals to regularly share ideas.
- Provide how-to books as a basis for programming. Professional organizations could produce these manuals to give teachers someplace to turn and provide a basis for their creativity.
- Develop joint conferences, planning, projects, and committees between general and special education. Give such teams a break on registration costs.
- Model what we believe.
- Watch language usage (avoid "yours" and "mine" or "us" and "them").
- Acknowledge fears; go slowly and rebuild trust. Special education has "dumped" and people have been burned. Do not stuff the idea of inclusion down people's throats; back off when possible.
- Let programs sell themselves. A general education teacher raving about a collaborative effort in the lounge may go a long way toward convincing people about the quality of a particular program.
- Promote local ownership. It may be great to bring in the outside expert to kick things off, but who is going to follow up and follow through?
- Define terms. Let's all speak the same language.
- Consider adjusting time schedules so the inservice training is mandatory (e.g., release at 1:00 p.m. once a month, adding the time to other days to meet state mandates).
- Provide for differing levels of information needs: awareness, knowledge, and skill levels.
- Develop professional libraries, including videos that people can watch at their leisure, and books on tape for people who commute. Thirty minutes

a day of listening while driving or riding a bus adds up to 2 1/2 hours per week!

- Distribute lapel pins, logos, or the like (e.g., apple sticker with the school's initials or the Council for Exceptional Children's inclusion pin).
- Work to increase the experiential component of teacher training so that more time is available for preservice teachers to apply what they learn. Encourage practical, useful projects.

Suggestions for maintaining collaboration through communication include

- Produce a monthly newsletter that includes practical tips on behavior management, social skills, attention deficit hyperactivity disorder. Try to link the newsletter content to real problems or to what is going on in the building.
- Make yourself available to help out when a colleague feels she or he has a problem; start with the teacher who seems to be the most receptive.
- Initiate collaboration–seek out other teachers and ask them for help in certain areas.
- Attend and get involved in general education activities, building-level duties, and staff meetings.
- Involve general education students in special education activities.
- Have a library of materials available and ask the librarian to distribute a list of materials available to check out.
- Encourage librarians to order materials/books dealing with personal development for teachers/students.
- Volunteer to team teach a unit or work on a special project with general education teachers and combine the classes.
- Establish peer tutoring between classes; students in special education can be the ones to move.
- Ask for administrators or community people to be guest speakers to promote positive interactions.
- Give demonstrations/programs to various community groups (e.g., PTA/O) regarding educational programs serving students with E/BD.
- Develop opportunities for community volunteers to work in the classrooms.
- Incorporate the idea of community service within the special education population–volunteer somewhere within school/community.
- Sponsor an open house for parents and others.
- Initiate a meeting for social service agency representatives to talk about issues and about how they can help develop a means of coordinating services.

To overcome the obstacle of labeling, the following suggestions were generated:

- Use the label to allow for the provision of positive assistance–meet with the general education teachers to let them know that *you* come with the student's label.
- Compile a list of characteristics and behaviors that might exist with the given label. Include possible interventions and strategies.
- Assist the teacher to see the student as one of his or her students, not as a special education student stuck in his or her class.

As professionals advocating for students with E/BD, we are faced with the realization that we must shift from providing the majority of educational programs for these students in a carefully engineered and monitored environment to the practice of helping others provide services in general education classrooms. Although it would be much easier to give up our roles during this time when "full inclusion" translates into wholesale replacement, we must not abdicate our commitment to the students who have the fewest advocates.

Inclusionary education is in keeping with the spirit of P.L. 101-476; the elimination of a full continuum of service options is not. Although few individuals will have the opportunity to make decisions which promote appropriate inclusionary strategies for a district or state, each of us can influence the practices which affect his or her own school.

Inclusion of Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders: The Issues, the Barriers, and Possible Solutions

Eleanor Guetzloe
University of South Florida
Clearwater

This report derived from discussions among a diverse group of professionals who met during the CCBD Working Forum on Inclusion. Major topics addressed by the group included (a) The Meaning of Inclusion: Identifying Issues and Goals, (b) Defining Plans to Ensure Appropriate Services to Students with E/BD within Inclusive Environments, and (c) Moving Toward Ideal Educational Placements for Students with E/BD: Overcoming Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors.

The Meaning of Inclusion: Identifying Issues and Goals

For purposes of this discussion, *inclusion* is described as a philosophical position, attitude, and value statement rather than a point on the continuum of special education services. The philosophy of inclusion is an individual and collective commitment among education professionals toward "ownership" of all students with disabilities and those who are at risk of being so identified, as well as those without disabilities. Those who advocate inclusion believe that all students with disabilities, regardless of the severity of their problems, belong in their home school–the school to which they would be assigned if they had not been identified as needing special services.

Among the more important elements of inclusion are (a) attending the home school–the same school that neighbors, siblings, or nondisabled peers attend and (b) being placed in regular education classes with classmates of the same chronological ages. At the same time, inclusion of students with disabilities also means having an individualized education program (IEP), as required by federal law, and being provided with the support necessary for success in that environment (e.g., special education and related services). Among the critical issues that relate specifically to the inclusion of students with emotional/behavioral disorders (E/BD) are the following:

1. Of all students with disabilities, students with E/BD are the least accepted and the least welcome in the regular school setting. They disrupt the learning of others as well as their own. They are difficult to manage and to teach and are, in fact, feared by many teachers and administrators in the regular school.
2. In many districts, students with E/BD are being assigned to their home schools, without the appropriate preparation of the receiving faculty, staff, and students and, in many cases, without the necessary support from special education personnel.
3. There is a critical shortage of highly skilled and knowledgeable teachers in the field of E/BD. The special education teachers that are available in a school district may be spread too thin across many classes or even several schools. This results in a reduction of special education support for students with E/BD.

Several participants noted that keeping the student with E/BD in the home school helps with a shift in attitude toward greater acceptance of students with disabilities. Faculty, staff, and parents gain a sense of shared responsibility for the youngsters with disabilities as well as their nondisabled peers. Everyone involved with schools and children comes to understand that all students are "our kids" in "our neighborhood" or "our community."

Examples of successful inclusion of students with learning disabilities were cited by a number of par-

ticipants. There was general agreement, however, that students with E/BD disorders are not viewed in the same positive light as those with learning disabilities. A particular problem exists when extremely disruptive and/or violent students are included in the regular school program. As stated by one participant, "chair throwers are not inclusion oriented."

The discussants were in agreement that other placement and service options must be available for those students with E/BD who cannot be successful in the regular school environment. A full continuum of services, as mandated by federal law, must be retained.

Among other possible obstacles to the implementation of inclusive programs are

1. The jargon used by special educators, including the terminology related to inclusion itself, which inhibits successful communication with other educators.
2. The identification process necessary for the provision of special education and related services. There is an enormous lapse of time between the initial referral by a general classroom teacher and the identification of the child as eligible for special education assistance. During that period (even with prereferral strategies in place), the student with E/BD usually gets worse.
3. Funding practices, such as weighted formulas, which provide more money for students identified as having E/BD who are served by teachers certified in special education. Concern was expressed that special education funding will be decreased as students with disabilities are included in the regular school program.
4. The logistical difficulties encountered in providing counseling and other related services to students with E/BD in the regular school (e.g., having ancillary school professionals with already overcrowded schedules traveling to a greater number of schools and classes and problems in scheduling time to meet with the students).
5. The amount of time required for collaborative planning. Resource teachers in a regular school have noted that it is very difficult to schedule time to meet with regular class teachers. Further, not all teachers work well in a collaborative, team-teaching, or co-teaching arrangement.
6. The ever-increasing standards for high school graduation, which do not allow for individual differences among students.

The following is an account of one regular educator's reaction to the inclusion movement:

> Two years ago, I attended an IEP meeting for one of my students who was identified as having a serious emotional disturbance. This child was (and is) also my neighbor. He was assigned to my class for social studies and because he was doing well, I argued that he did not need a more restrictive placement. The assessment team said, however, that he needed a more structured environment and teachers with special skills in managing the behavior of such students.
>
> I see this child often in the neighborhood, and it is evident to me that his behavior, if anything, is worse. Now the same "specialists" want to send him back to me. I am no more skilled than I was two years ago; I don't know any more about emotional disturbance than I did then.

Defining Plans to Ensure Appropriate Services to Students with E/BD within Inclusive Environments

Extensive cooperation and collaboration between and among general and special educators, parents, ancillary personnel, administrators, and community agencies is essential to the success of inclusive programs. There was general agreement that having a *building team* is an important factor. Team planning should take place as soon as any student in the school exhibits emotional and/or behavioral problems. Further, if a student with E/BD is removed from his or her home school, a considerable amount of advance planning is necessary before that student is reintegrated (e.g., careful selection of teachers, classrooms, courses, classmates, schedules). Every effort should be made to ensure a smooth and successful transition, particularly for a student with E/BD.

Participants from several school districts described various models of inclusive programs that are already in place and meeting with some degree of success: consultation, co-teaching, and *a class within a class*. In all cases, the regular educators and special educators work closely together in the planning and implementation of both instruction and behavior management. Critical issues cited were (a) the selection of teachers who can work together successfully and (b) the allocation of sufficient time during the school day for collaborative planning.

Working with Parents

Parents must be included in the initial planning of inclusive programs for their students with E/BD, not merely part of the discussion after a plan has been developed. It is also extremely important that parents have freedom of choice regarding both the level and location of services for their students with E/BD. Parents have verbalized their concern that the inclusion movement might result in a reduction of placement options for their children.

Preparing the Environment for a Student with E/BD

The classmates of the student with E/BD (a) need to understand the characteristics and behaviors that may be exhibited by this student and (b) possess the social skills necessary to deal with him or her on a daily basis. This demands a great deal of youngsters–actually more than is asked of most teachers in general education.

Training of Teachers and Other School Personnel

It is generally agreed that an enormous amount of training (for both general and special educators) is necessary in order to provide a successful inclusive program for students with E/BD. Specific areas of knowledge and skill needed by regular educators include (a) the nature and needs of students with E/BD, (b) classroom management of disturbed and disruptive students, (c) development and implementation of the individualized education program, (d) strategies for teaching social skills, and (e) affective education. Special educators, who should already possess those skills, need knowledge of and experience with regular education policies, procedures, and curriculum. For both general and special educators, specific training in collaboration is essential.

It was noted, however, that not all teachers need the same training. Having an "official" district training module or course of study, which requires all teachers to participate in the same inservice training, creates ill will. Instead, a menu of training options should be made available to teachers, so they can select the specific skills they need.

Moving Toward Ideal Educational Placements for Students with E/BD: Overcoming Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal

The following themes emerged from our discussion on overcoming the barriers to inclusion: (a) necessary changes in policies and procedures, (b) creation of a climate of acceptance of students with E/BD, (c) provision of services within the school, (d) special environmental accommodations, and (e) personnel training. Stress was placed on the need for collaborative planning between and among all individuals and agencies involved with the schools, the students, and their families.

Changes in Policies and Procedures

As already mentioned, one barrier to inclusion is the very process required for provision of special education services. It is still important to identify those needing services, but the process must be shortened. If students with E/BD are to be successfully included in the general school program, then they are better served by receiving any necessary services *immediately* in the home school–without an inordinate amount of either paperwork or fanfare. Decisions regarding the provision of related services can be made by a home school team and the parents or guardians, in a similar vein as the decision to implement prereferral strategies.

Other policy changes that should be addressed include the allocation of funds, teacher certification requirements, and discipline within the school. Over time, the responsibility for making such policy decisions should shift to the home school and community, along with the responsibility for providing educational programs for students with E/BD. The movement toward establishing School Advisory Committees with representatives from the school, parent groups, and the community at large, may be supportive of this shift in decision making.

Creating a Climate of Acceptance of Students with E/BD

Many group members felt that understanding and acceptance (by students, teachers, administrators, staff, parents of other students, and the community) of the student with E/BD was the single most critical issue related to inclusion. Empathy, acceptance, and understanding can be taught and should be addressed in the student curriculum and parent meetings as well as in the training of school personnel. Every effort should be made to show students with E/BD in their most positive light. School and community service activities should be deliberately planned to further this goal.

Participants felt that regular classroom teachers will be much more accepting of students with E/BD when they experience success in working with them. "In-house" teacher training can be conducted using videotapes that show the techniques used by successful teachers in management and instruction of students with E/BD. It was noted that successful classroom management techniques and affective education are not "classified information."

Providing Services Within the School

It is essential that all educational and related services be readily available in the home school, which requires the cooperation of community agencies that normally provide those services. The *full-service school* is an appropriate model for inclusionary programs for students with disabilities. As a specific student or family need is identified (e.g., medical examinations or treatment, mental health services, literacy programs, or vocational assistance), the necessary service can be made available at the school site.

Environmental Considerations

Wherever students with E/BD may be housed for their education program, there will be a need for a *safe space* outside the regular classroom for dealing with crises (which will undoubtedly occur) as well as trained faculty and staff available to assist students during periods of crisis. Among the skills identified as highly desirable for the *crisis staff* were verbal de-escalation and physical intervention. It was noted that a special education teacher cannot be a team teacher or a co-teacher while managing crises for the entire grade level or school. Accordingly, additional staff will be necessary.

Personnel Training

Collaborative arrangements for personnel training should be established with universities and colleges in or near the communities in which there are inclusive programs. Training must be made available for all instructional and noninstructional staff (e.g., teachers, administrators, instructional aides, librarians, counselors, secretaries, custodians, cafeteria workers, bus drivers, and volunteers) who come into contact with the student with E/BD. University classes and inservice workshops will not be sufficient; faculty and staff (including administrators) need follow-up observation, coaching, and conferencing within the school. It is especially crucial that the building administrator be accepting of these students, knowledgeable about their needs in the school setting, and skillful in managing their behavior.

It is the responsibility of colleges and universities to establish preservice and graduate training programs that address the knowledge and skill areas necessary for successful inclusion of children with all kinds of disabilities as well as children at risk of being identified as needing special education services. These courses or components should be available to (and required of) all individuals entering the field of education. Practical experience in working with students with disabilities (particularly those with E/BD) should be part of the program.

Summary

Our discussion has focused on major issues that relate specifically to the inclusion of students with E/BD in the regular school program. We identified barriers to successful inclusion as well as suggestions for overcoming these obstacles.

It is difficult to predict the future of the inclusion movement. It is safe to say, however, that its success rests largely on the collective efforts of general and special educators, administrators, teacher-educators, staff development specialists, parents, and students who share a common perspective on appropriate services for students with emotional and behavioral disorders.

Promoting Inclusive Education for Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders

Joseph P. Price
Grand Valley State University
Grand Rapids, MI

The information provided in this paper was generated by the participants in one of the small dialogue groups at the CCBD Working Forum on Inclusion.

The Meaning of Inclusion: Identifying Issues and Goals

From the outset of the discussion by participants in this dialogue group, it was evident that the group members were well aware of the long-standing controversy associated with implementing *full inclusion* for students with E/BD and readily adopted the principles derived from the concept of a least restrictive environment (LRE), originally mandated by Public Law 94-142 (now known as IDEA). Using this law as the guide for discussion, participants created a working definition of inclusive education for students with E/BD as follows:

> *The provision of free services, with non-disabled age-mates, in neighborhood schools, in general education classes, under the guidance of general education teachers, with the assistance of special education staff and resources, to the full extent possible, as determined appropriate by an individualized education planning committee.*

While placement of students with E/BD in general education classrooms was viewed as a laudable goal, group members were unanimous in their opinion that many students with E/BD would not be able to profit from full-time participation in these settings, even with extensive program modifications and support from special education personnel; therefore, other program options must be available.

Through extensive discussion, the group identified several critical issues that serve as major obstacles to providing inclusive services to children and youth with E/BD. They include

- Attitudes. As school personnel learn about various acts of defiance or aggression, they often assume that students with E/BD cannot be socially controlled and will eventually threaten the peace and progress of their classrooms. Acting on these assumptions, teachers tend to restrict students with E\BD from general education programs whenever possible (Wood, 1985).
- Definition and Policies. The federal definition of *serious emotional disturbance* was included in Public Law 94-142 to help establish a criteria for service eligibility through the use of labels that are descriptive of children's unique features. Yet the outcome has been to place students in segregated classrooms based on common labels, with little consideration given to their diverse qualities.

  A problem closely related to the practice of *label and place* is the requirement for teachers to have endorsements that match the labels of students under their supervision. This *label-matching* policy further contributes to the tracking and isolation of students with E/BD.
- Funding. During the last two decades, the use of a dual funding (and accounting) system has inadvertently led to the creation of a rigid two-tier placement pattern (e.g., general education and special education) with few incentives to provide an inclusive education program. Additionally, the rising cost of education and the current goal to reduce school expenditures compels many administrators to offer children and youth with E/BD the minimum services possible, rather than pur-

sue the most appropriate benefits, as required by law (Michigan State Board of Education, 1993).

- Personnel Preparation. There are a series of attitudes, values, and training orientations expressed by educators which help to impede the implementation of inclusive services. As a group, special educators tend to develop a strong sense of ownership about their (segregated) students, and feel that general educators rarely take full advantage of the support available from special education personnel. In contrast, regular educators perceive "special" students as being in need of "special" teachers and frequently joke about the easy life of special educators, with their small class loads and full-time paraprofessionals. These negative attitudes do little to motivate teachers in either field to collaborate on developing quality programs for children and youth with E/BD within general education settings.
- Research and Evaluation. There is a considerable body of research literature, along with reams of personal testimonies that extol the merits of inclusive services for students with mild to moderate disabilities. However, very limited evidence is available to support *full* inclusion of students with E/BD in general education classrooms (York, Vandercook, MacDonald, Heise-Neff, & Caughney, 1992). Given the paucity of such evidence, a national movement to fully integrate students with E/BD without adequate knowledge and preparations could lead to enormous disappointments and hardships for both students and teachers.
- Identification and Dissemination. Current levels of identification and dissemination of information across the country on model programs are grossly inadequate to meet the enormous needs of students with E/BD. This absence of an adequate dissemination network to effectively showcase best practices creates an enormous inequity of services and opportunities for success among students.

We believe that it is through the removal of these impediments that the ultimate goal of maximizing the development of each student with E/BD can be realized. This goal requires the best individualized education plan (IEP) imaginable in the context of a least restrictive environment. Yet service providers must recognize that today's best programs may not be adequate to truly maximize the development of many children and youth with E/BD (Kozleski, 1993). To reach this level of service, it will require moving beyond our current knowledge-base in search of answers to the types of questions inherent in the action plan described in the next section.

Defining Plans to Ensure Appropriate Services to Students with E/BD within Inclusive Environments

In view of the common barriers to inclusive education experienced by students with E/BD throughout the country, formulation of a well-designed action plan for a building, or a district, is viewed as an important initial step to ensure appropriate services. One model of a salient plan would incorporate the following:

- Task Force Development. Assemble various role group representatives committed to promoting inclusive services for students with E/BD and to formulating a plan of action. It is important that the task force consist of a broad range of school and community members, including parents, to reflect a cross section of views that could be incorporated into a balanced philosophy statement and a clear mission statement, from which a course of action would be developed.
- Policy Review and Modification. Examine current policies (e.g., definition, funding) to identify changes needed to expedite service delivery to students with E/BD. Seek adoption of these recommendations by the local school board.
- Student and Personnel Preparation. Conduct a needs assessment for each role group and implement a training program based on the results of the study. The training program must give consideration to information gleaned from extant research literature and the experiences of local staff and neighboring communities.
- Accountability of Staff. Formulate guidelines which address questions of authority and responsibility for students under various conditions within the school. For example, under what condition will regular education teachers provide instructions to students with E/BD placed in general education classrooms? Will special educators be allowed to teach general education students? Who is ultimately responsible for students with E/BD? What should be acceptable standards of performance in each content area, including affective areas? What methods should be used to evaluate student performance?
- Resource Allocation. Develop a framework for the distribution of adequate and appropriate resources to each group participating in the promotion of inclusive education programs. A few of the commonly identified resources are (a) time to meet and to plan with others, (b) active support from administration, (c) funds to hire consultants and substitute teachers, and (d) funds to pay for site visits and remedial materials.

- Research and Evaluation. Establish a research and evaluation unit to closely monitor inclusive services and to help resolve questions about such issues as curriculum and teaching methods, use of support staff, class size, number of students with E/BD, scheduling, planning and collaborating, and multiple outcomes. This process would greatly contribute to the identification and dissemination of best practices developed at the building-level or in a district.

Moving Toward Ideal Educational Placements for Students with E/BD: Overcoming Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal

If an individual school or a community sincerely wants to initiate inclusive services for students with E/BD in the most efficient and least disruptive manner, then it should begin with a modest-size project and ensure that certain measures are in place before launching a larger operation. The first of these measures would be the formation of a work group, or task force as previously described. A next step would be to prepare an environment in which students will be successful in their adjustment to the new program. We recommend this process begin with a request that experienced teachers and staff participate in a pilot project.

As staff members self-select their partners, harmonious teams could be developed within a school or selected buildings and encouraged to collaborate on developing effective working arrangements and service-delivery procedures in a general education classroom. There would be a need for guidance from supervisory personnel as it relates to basic policy issues (e.g., confidentiality, IEP, suspension restriction). However, extensive formal training could be postponed as members of these teams create their own strategies to decide on such things as appropriate seating arrangements, materials to be used, standards of performance, methods of evaluation, teaching and co-teaching arrangements, role of the paraprofessional, and so on. Even while implementing a pilot program, parents should be involved in the process.

The selection and placement of a student in a specific classroom should stem from negotiations among members of the planning and placement committee, which should include the teaching team. Through a review and discussion of evaluative data, progress reports, and placement information, the committee—in consultation with administrators and parents—would make a decision about the most appropriate general education setting. Using socioemotional maturity as a major criterion, the committee would provide evidence that the student had clearly demonstrated ample control over hostile-aggressive forms of disruptive behavior and could adapt to the requirements of a specific classroom with reasonable support from special education personnel.

As a student approaches readiness for inclusive services, the candidate must be prepared to participate adequately in the designated classroom. A variety of suggestions were offered by the dialogue group which include helping the student to

1. Learn the new routines and procedures.
2. Gain familiarity with new material through use in the special education room.
3. Meet students by visiting them during their lunch time and participating in extracurricular activities.
4. Adopt behaviors consistent with standards in the new program.
5. Participate in similar teaching-learning arrangements (e.g., group instructions, peer coaching, and/or projects).
6. Develop a relationship with the new teacher during his or her preparation period or after school.

Once a student with E/BD has been properly groomed to participate in an assigned regular classroom, continuous support services will be required to help the student maintain an adequate level of performance. Some of the desired services that staff should anticipate are to

1. Modify the IEP–as appropriate or required.
2. Closely observe the student and maintain records in the affective and cognitive areas.
3. Provide performance feedback based on regular evaluations.
4. Help the student to recognize potential problems in social, emotional, and academic areas.
5. Help the students to formulate and implement effective coping strategies.
6. Provide easy channels of communication between the student and the total team.
7. Send periodic reports to parents, administrators, and allied agencies.
8. Provide parents with opportunities to observe the student either through direct observation, or through videotapes.

With these initial considerations in place, more elaborate procedures as described in the action plan need to be undertaken and modified in preparation for implementing inclusive services throughout the district.

Conclusion

The successful inclusion of students with E/BD (especially in communities where social behavior is perceived as a serious problem) will require the emergence of a strong set of community values acknowledging the importance and worth of each individual. Even with a strong commitment to the well-being of children and youth with E/BD, the community will need to develop a realistic set of expectations regarding the school's capacity to deliver critical services, along with a clear awareness of the resources required to be effective. With representatives of various groups working closely together and pursuing small increments of success, new opportunities for more comprehensive services will unfold, enabling educators and students to experience the joy of teaching and learning in what will truly be the best form of inclusion for each student with E/BD.

References

Kozleski, E.B. (1993). Reflections on "Taylor's story: Full inclusion in her neighborhood elementary school. *Exceptionality, 4*(3), 193-197.

Michigan State Board of Education. (1993). *Final report of the education recommendations committee: Findings and recommendations.* Lansing, MI: Author.

Wood, F.H. (1985). Issues in the identification and placement of behaviorally disordered students. *Behavioral Disorders, 10,* 219-228.

York, J., Vandercook, T., MacDonald, C., Heise-Neff, C., & Caughney, E. (1992). Feedback about integrating middle-school students with severe disabilities in general education classes. *Exceptional Children. 58,* 244-258.

Welcoming Back Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders into the Least Restrictive Environments Appropriate

Sharon A. Maroney
Buena Vista College
Storm Lake, IA

This paper deals with some of the major ideas discussed by one of the dialogue groups at the CCBD Working Forum on Inclusion. The major focus of this group's discussion dealt with the task of defining *inclusion*, the resulting questions and concerns, and the major considerations needed in planning to serve in inclusive environments students with emotional and behavioral disorders (E/BD). The ideas and concepts that follow are an attempt to reflect the consensus of the members of this group.

The Meaning of Inclusion: Identifying Issues and Goals

In attempting to define inclusion, some group members had conceptualized a working definition for this term and held the position that this term was easily defined. Other group members were struggling to gain clarification for what was to them a term with an illusive meaning. The following statements pertaining to the definition were proposed by the group.

Inclusion is . . .

- Providing full integration for students with disabilities in regular classrooms.
- Providing education in regular classrooms to enable students with disabilities to be educated in their neighborhood schools.
- Providing students with disabilities real-life experiences in the natural environment of a regular classroom, as opposed to special education classes which often strive to simulate the regular classroom.
- Special education and general education teachers planning and teaching together to provide students with disabilities appropriate and effective educational programs.

As with any definition, a number of questions and concerns were expressed:

- Does inclusion always encompass an "all-means-all" philosophy or can it refer to the hand picking of students, teachers, and/or schools for inclusive activities?
- Does the adoption of the philosophy of inclusion necessitate abandoning the philosophy of providing a *continuum of services* to all students with disabilities?
- In defining inclusive environments, which environments are acceptable? Must the regular classroom with same-age peers be the focus of inclusive activities and programming or can a work setting with varying age coworkers be acceptable?
- When is inclusion appropriate or inappropriate? How do we evaluate this question?

As these questions were discussed, two significant statements emerged:

- "It looks like many of us are being asked to do something that we cannot define."
- "At the start of this discussion I felt, 'Inclusion? Let's all do it.' But now I'm thinking, 'Inclusion? Should we be doing it?'"

As the focus of our discussion shifted, the ideas discussed in the following sections emerged.

Least Restrictive Environment

While the philosophy of inclusion might currently be viewed as socially and politically correct, it is not the law. What educators should be doing is adhering to the legal basis for special education. All special education programming decisions must be driven by the mandates of Public Law 94-142 (now known as IDEA),

which include the provision of an education in the least restrictive environment (LRE) appropriate as determined by the individual needs of each student and of a continuum of programming options to all students with disabilities. If inclusion is defined as providing the greatest degree of integrated opportunities for some students with disabilities, then inclusive programming is an important and necessary option along this continuum.

Whether each and every professional in special education adopts the philosophy of inclusion is not important. What is important is the fact that the inclusion movement will serve to open up many new doors within the LRE for all students with disabilities. Many special educators and regular educators involved in inclusive programming are taking a new look at regular classrooms, school-wide activities, communities, and work places, and are identifying potential inclusive environments and inclusive activities that may be appropriate for students with disabilities. As a result, inclusion may serve to increase dramatically the options and opportunities for all students with disabilities.

Welcoming Back Students with E/BD

In general, inclusion is promoted as a philosophy to be followed in the integration of students with severe, profound, and multiple disabilities into the regular classroom and school-wide activities and facilities. Regular educators, administrators, and parents are asked to *welcome in* students who had previously not been given the opportunity to participate in such non-segregated environments. The accepting attitudes on the part of many persons involved may be based on the premise: "Sure, let's give these kids a chance!"

However, when considering the inclusion of students with E/BD, general educators are being asked to *welcome back* students who previously had been in regular education classrooms and school-wide activities. As a result of repeated and severe behavior disturbances, these students were removed from those environments. The decision now to *welcome back* these students is clouded by those past experiences, failures, and frustrations with students with E/BD. The first task of special educators when considering the inclusive programming for students with E/BD is to address this important difference between *welcoming in* and *welcoming back*.

Defining Plans to Ensure Appropriate Services to Students with E/BD within Inclusive Environments

The dialogue group tackled the question:

> If asked to consider inclusive programming for students with E/BD, what must be done to make inclusion work?

The numerous ideas generated focused on (a) issues in the identification of students with E/BD, (b) interagency and community needs, (c) family needs, (d) teacher needs, and (e) attitudes needed.

Issues in the Identification of Students with E/BD

All effective education for students with E/BD must begin with appropriate identification with an emphasis on the strengths of individual students. Student strengths should be used in working to remediate student deficits. Programming and instructional decisions must not be driven by a categorical label but rather by the individual needs of each student.

In some cases, inclusion should begin prior to the identification of an emotional/ behavioral disorder. Students experiencing behavioral difficulties in the regular classroom and/or during school-wide activities may benefit from various interventions and accommodations popular in inclusive programming. In all cases, interventions should be carefully planned, systematically implemented, and their effectiveness documented to enable these students to succeed in the LRE and possibly to prevent the development of an emotional/behavioral disorder. This process can be viewed as inclusive programming in the best sense of the word, prior to the need for the identification of a disability.

Interagency and Community Needs

Providing successful inclusive programs will necessitate effective and efficient interagency and community coordination and collaboration to a greater extent than many educators have previously experienced. Providing for the effective inclusion of students with E/BD is viewed as an interagency and a community concern, requiring interagency and community-based solutions.

The first step in this process is the identification of the various agencies currently providing services to students with E/BD and their families, with a careful delineation of the specific services provided. The effectiveness of such services must also be evaluated to determine which agencies can most effectively provide which type of services. This process will enable agencies to focus on those things they do best and will reduce the duplication of services across agencies and community resources.

A major focus of all interagency and community action must be the transitioning needs of students with E/BD and their families. Needs analysis, direct services, and follow-up should be provided to enable students with E/BD to become contributing members of the community. This can only be accomplished through an effective team approach which focuses on the successful inclusion of students with E/BD in the home, school, community, and workplace.

Family Needs

Faced with the fact that services and support for the families of students with E/BD have not been as effective as we would like, this group felt there was growing recognition that our approaches need to be altered and services intensified. The needs of each family must be determined so that appropriate services can be made available. This situation, again, like the needs of the students themselves, necessitates interagency/community planning and interagency/community-based solutions. Families need to be provided with the skills and support to implement interventions that can be effective in their individual situations.

Parents, as well as students with E/BD, must be taught how to become self-advocates. In order to self-advocate, individuals must have not only the knowledge pertaining to rights and responsibilities and the range of available services, but also the communication skills needed to request and access services.

Teacher Needs

Teachers involved in inclusive programming must be provided with emotional, instructional, and administrative support. It is expected that the stress level of even the most effective teachers will rise when faced with the new challenges associated with inclusion. In implementing inclusive programming, all too frequently teachers have been given new responsibilities and additional jobs to perform without being (a) compensated by a reduction of previously held responsibilities, (b) given additional planning time and classroom assistance, (c) provided with the required skills and information, and/or (d) given additional pay. As new philosophies of education are adopted, teachers may need assistance in refocusing priorities and in redefining their professional roles and responsibilities. Administrators and others need to recognize this fact and make substantive efforts to provide the various types of support needed by teachers.

With the adoption of inclusive programming for students with E/BD, teachers must be provided with support in the areas of instructional and behavioral interventions. Techniques which have been proven effective, either by research or by the documented use with particular students, need to be identified. Knowledge of *best practices* in both special education and general education, especially those which show promise in collaborative teaching settings, will be needed by all teachers in inclusive environments. In an effort to *welcome back* students with E/BD into regular classrooms, teachers will need support in identifying those factors associated with previous student failure and in making the appropriate changes and accommodations. Skills needed in the evaluation and documentation of instructional and behavioral strategies used will serve to facilitate effective and efficient decision making for educators.

Throughout the entire process of inclusive programming, planning time and flexible scheduling may be identified as top priorities for teachers and all team members. In addition to the needs of current teachers, teacher training programs must provide future special education and general education teachers with skills in the areas of team teaching, alternative methods of instruction, behavioral interventions, collaboration and cooperation, and evaluation of the effectiveness of alternative instruction and alternative programming.

Attitudes Needed

As stated earlier, inclusive programming will require a team approach–one in which members are creative, flexible, and able to give up previously held territories. Team members must also trust that their colleagues can and will provide appropriate services to students with E/BD and their families. Team members must be willing to think of and to implement new ideas in new ways. Programming efforts must not be hampered by funding regulations, legal restrictions, and/or previously held attitudes regarding the education of students with E/BD and their families. In considering inclusive programming for students with E/BD, there is a need to begin inclusive interventions with students experiencing behavioral difficulties *prior* to assigning a "disability" label.

Moving Toward Ideal Educational Placements for Students with E/BD: Overcoming Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal

The consensus of the dialogue group was that whether we choose to adopt the philosophy of inclusion or hold to the least restrictive environment mandate, the most critical factor affecting the success or failure of programming for students with E/BD may be the attitudes held by all team members with regard to these students. All school personnel, the students with E/BD, their nondisabled peers, and the families of all students must be prepared for inclusion if it is be successful!

Eliminating the Confusion About Inclusion: Providing Appropriate Services to Our Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders

Beverley H. Johns
Jacksonville Public Schools
Jacksonville, IL

The Meaning of Inclusion: Identifying Issues and Goals

It is time to put to rest the confusion over inclusion and focus on the individual needs of children and youth. Special educators' focus must be working to ensure success for students with E/BD in whatever educational environment is most appropriate. At the same time, we must ensure that our students are included in appropriate school settings rather than excluded through the all too common methods of suspension and expulsion.

Inclusion is an emotionally charged issue, in part, because of the extremist viewpoint that some in our own profession have taken–that *all* children and youth should be served in the general education environment. At the same time many who advocate full inclusion, when questioned about students with E/BD state: "We're not talking about those students." Those who advocate for special needs students should advocate for the rights of all students including students with E/BD.

Since the inception of Public Law 94-142 (now known as IDEA), inclusion has always been an option to be considered in deciding about each individual student's placement. Yet historically it has not perhaps been considered as often as it should have been because of (a) special educators' zeal to serve students with special needs and fear that these students would fail in the regular classroom and be excluded from school and (b) some general educators' fear that they lack the expertise to work with children and youth with special needs. Even so, the current inclusion movement has made all of us aware that we must always consider the general education environment as an option.

Full inclusion or total inclusion–the philosophy that *all* children are most appropriately served in a general education classroom–has angered many professionals. For example, the so-called moderates are upset because many have been in the field for a number of years and remember well the history of special education programs. They recognize that not all students with E/BD can be successful in a general education environment. They feel as do many others that the "one size fits all" approach does not work with clothes and it certainly will not work with children and youth.

James M. Kauffman (1993) warns that "universal remedies are delusions." He further states that progress typically comes through everyday activities. We need to look at the everyday activities that are successful with our special needs students and share those with others. Likewise, we need to quit what is not working and let others know what does not work. There are no "quick fix" solutions; as educators we need to resist the temptation to jump on every bandwagon in hopes of achieving quick fixes. Throughout this CCBD Forum participants in small groups discussed what it takes to make inclusion as an important option work. Foremost among the questions posed was "What are the critical issues related to inclusion of our students with E/BD?" Responses from the group I participated in included

- The confusion about the definition of terms must be eliminated. As a school district develops a position on inclusion, that district must define the terms used and ensure that any terms used are in concert with the federal law and recent court interpretations.
- Rather than eliminating some of the service delivery options, all options must be defined and some

expanded upon (e.g., teacher collaboration). The children and youth we serve today exhibit many challenging behaviors that necessitate creative solutions to ensure that individual needs are met.

- As those who work with children involved with multiple agencies refine the "wrap-around" model of interagency coordination and collaboration, they must resolve the dilemma of a lack of a mandate to provide services for any agency other than the school and define the role of the school. It may emerge that a legislative mandate is needed to define the specific service-delivery roles of all agencies involved.
- Educators are looking for step-by-step directions for developing comprehensive services. To attain those step-by-step directions, educators must first identify those programs that work well over an extended period of time and result in positive outcomes for our students. Then the specific elements that make them work must be identified and the necessary steps to duplicate these programs be determined.
- It is not surprising that cost is a critical issue. At a time of serious budget cuts in education across the country, we must critically look at what motivates some individuals. Do they want to implement inclusion as a way to save money or do they want to implement it as an appropriate option for serving students? Many authorities agree that inclusion done properly will often cost more money, not less.
- There are no short cuts. It must be recognized that implementing innovative practices in a district requires (a) a long range plan, (b) slow and deliberate implementation and (c) the involvement of all parties. Any plan must be comprehensive and have support at all levels with administrative support especially critical. Plan developers must address the fear many have about change and identify the specific fears of each party (e.g., resistance among general educators who are not trained to work with special needs students).
- Supplementary aids and services need to be defined. Too often the "aid" is an "aide," even though other aids and services might be more effective and appropriate for the student with E/BD (e.g., a team teaching arrangement).

Another issue that surfaced during group discussion was "What do we do with students who are violent?" As this population grows in all segments of our society, educators must find a way to deal with the issue of safety in the schools and determine the role of mental health, corrections, and other agencies in establishing a long-term solution.

Lastly, university and public school personnel must work together to ensure adequate pre- and inservice training that not only reflects the changes occurring in public education, but also squarely addresses the needs of the practitioner.

As we face issues related to inclusion, this group believed that we must strive to achieve the following goals:

1. Develop a systematic long-term approach involving all stakeholders in order to ensure the appropriate delivery of services to students with E/BD.
2. Identify effective inclusion programs and disseminate information about those programs on a widespread basis.
3. Coordinate university training programs with school systems.
4. Develop a comprehensive prevention system.

Defining Plans to Ensure Appropriate Services to Students with E/BD within Inclusive Environments

Several alternative plans that warrant consideration in a local school district were discussed. Some of their key elements include

- It is critical that at the building-level, a core committee of key stakeholders should analyze what is already being done within the school that can be strengthened. That committee should review several models for delivery of services and determine what might work best in that particular building. All resources available within the school and within the community should be identified and utilized.
- Students with E/BD often are involved with other community agencies. Consequently, for students to be successful in inclusive environments, schools cannot work in isolation but rather must learn to develop effective interagency networks and councils. It is critical that the appropriate school personnel meet and interact with other agencies and determine what services those agencies can and cannot provide. Finally, a coordinating council of all agencies involved with students within a school is essential to establish support systems for students.
- Schools should develop "Positive Prevention Plans" for those students with behavioral problems prior to referral to special education. This will require schools to identify the support systems necessary to assist teachers in implementing the plan.
- "Behavioral Management Plans" should be identified for all students with E/BD regardless of the least restrictive environment of the students. Those

plans should be data based and reviewed frequently through the individualized education plan (IEP) process to determine necessary alterations.

- In recognition of the growing number of students with behavioral problems, including problems of a violent nature, all general education environments should include a crisis intervention team of at least four individuals. The team could consist of general and special teachers, an administrator, and others; be on call for a crisis situation; and be trained in nonviolent crisis prevention and intervention. The team should meet regularly and establish comprehensive procedures for dealing with a crisis at the building level.
- Any plan requires ongoing training of all staff in the building, from the custodian to the administrator to the bus drivers. A 30-minute inservice session, or even a 1-day workshop, once a year will not suffice. Rather, ongoing training to staff in prevention and intervention is needed. Parents, too, must be involved in the process and general education students need to be trained to accept the individual differences of other students. Regular assessment of the training needs of all parties must be part of the plan and those needs met on an ongoing basis. Likewise, an adequate number of staff must be given the time to collaborate on behalf of students with special needs.
- Social skills training is becoming a necessity for all students. Many school districts provide this as an elective credit for high school students. Promising results have been achieved in the use of conflict resolution and peer mediation at the school-building level. School districts interested in teaching students how to resolve their own differences may consider implementing such procedures.
- Among other steps a district will want to consider is the introduction of a co-teaching arrangement. This can involve hiring permanent substitutes to allow time for the general education and special education teachers to collaborate. To ensure this collaboration on an ongoing basis, it should be incorporated into a student's IEP.
- While school districts are implementing the procedures just listed, they should work closely with university researchers to establish a research agenda to evaluate the efficacy of various inclusive practices.

In order for these ideas to be successful, school building personnel and agency workers must accept equal responsibility and jointly outline each person's and agency's responsibilities with respect to a specific student.

As more substantive information is known about what works and what does not work across the country, a database of model programs with documented effectiveness should be created and a means of dissemination established.

Moving Toward Ideal Educational Placements for Students with E/BD: Overcoming Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal

What constitutes the ideal and how do we overcome the barriers in reaching the ideal? Most participants in this dialogue group believed that true interagency coordination and collaboration are critical as well as easy access among all agencies. Immediate attention should be given to those students who need it and each student must have an effective advocate to ensure that necessary services are provided in a timely manner.

There must be a whole range of options available to each student; those options should exist in a system where there is shared responsibility and collaboration between special and general education. For such a system, administrative support is critical, and we as special educators must start inviting regular educators to be active participants in the problem-solving process on behalf of students with special needs.

In the ideal system, there are adequate crisis-prevention and -intervention specialists, social workers, nurses, and those individuals skilled in collaboration. However, teachers' input on what they need to be successful with a student should be regularly sought and responding to that input by providing them with the required resources should be ongoing.

In all school systems, staff must work to establish consistent discipline policies that no longer use exclusion from school as the major consequence. We must all work together to become better prepared to deal with the increasing number of students who exhibit violent behavior. The discipline procedures of the 1970s are no longer effective. Drawing upon the skills of personnel with a background in E/BD, districts must develop effective behavioral management strategies for all students.

How do we overcome obstacles in reaching the ideal? We must have adequate funding for programs–inclusion as an option done correctly will cost more money, not less. Inclusion cannot be used as an excuse to cut funds. Education's policy makers need to realize that entitlements require funding and if more emphasis is placed on early prevention of behavioral problems, then savings will likely occur later in the correctional system. Likewise, we as educators must effectively manage available resources and be creative

in seeking grants to fund model programs and conduct the research so desperately needed.

We must actively advocate for our students and for the funding necessary. We must tell the public the good things that are happening in programs for students with emotional/behavioral disorders.

The term, inclusion, needs clarification. There are those "extremists" who advocate "all children in the regular classroom." I believe those same extremists are giving a bad name to inclusion and eliciting an unfortunate fear of it. In their zeal for inclusion, some have succeeded in" turning off" many general educators, thereby increasing the difficulty of ensuring inclusion for a student when it is appropriate.

Conclusion

In closing, let me say that it is now time to recognize that inclusion should be viewed as one of a wide array of options to keep students in school, and to ensure success for students with emotional/behavioral disorders.

References

Kauffman, J. (1993). How we might achieve the radical reform of special education. *Exceptional Children, 60,* 6-15.

A New Age of Enlightenment in Public Education: Prerequisite for the Successful Inclusion of Students with Emotional/Behavioral Disorders

Kevin Callahan
University of North Texas
Denton, TX

In Western Europe during the 18th century, the great philosophic minds of that age were often engaged in lively debate about the complexities and scope of human knowledge and its implications on the more traditional disciplines of politics, economics, and theology. The philosophic movement brought about by these forward-looking, creative thinkers came to be known as the Enlightenment. This era was characterized by

- The principle of accepting reason as the guiding authority in determining one's opinions and course of actions.
- An impetus toward learning.
- A spirit of skepticism and empiricism in the shaping of social and political thought.

In short, the leaders of the Enlightenment demonstrated a commitment to human reason, science, and education as the best means of building and maintaining a free and stable society (Anchor, 1967).

During the CCBD Working Forum on Inclusion, a variety of parallels between the themes and conditions surrounding the classical Age of Enlightenment and current issues confronting the field of special education became strikingly apparent. Most obvious, of course, were the sights and sounds of over 250 educational professionals from across the United States and Canada participating in much the same kind of discussion shared by the likes of Voltaire, Locke, and Rousseau more than 200 years earlier. Like much of the discourse of the Enlightenment philosophers, the focus of the Working Forum participants was on an issue of paramount societal significance–the education of children and youth with disabilities.

Because the importance of this analogy emphasizing enlightened thought and behavior extends far beyond the collaborative, constructive Forum on Inclusion, the remainder of this chapter attempts to frame a discussion of inclusion and school reform around a comparison between critical aspects of the original Enlightenment and current responses to issues which could shape the education of students with emotional and behavioral disorders (E/BD) well into the 21st century.

Specifically, I will argue that what is needed to successfully proceed with inclusion and the reform of special education is a New Age of Enlightenment—that is, a return to a guiding philosophy for *all* educators. This philosophy should emphasize the importance of a systematic application of empirical knowledge in schools and classrooms, decision making based on an understanding and appreciation of historical antecedents, and the practice of rational, reasonable thought. Adopting a new enlightened approach to solving the challenges of inclusion is education's best hope to avoid reckless implementation of programs and models which may negatively impact the lives of students, and which, in retrospect, may one day be denounced as having been misguided, ill-conceived, and ultimately, harmful to society.

The Meaning of Inclusion: Identifying Issues and Goals

To construct a universally acceptable meaning of inclusion requires that the issue be appropriately discussed within a philosophical context. More often than not, the questions asked about inclusion, and the issues raised both in favor of and in opposition to inclusive practices derive from one's philosophical perspectives (see, for example, Council for Exceptional Children, 1993; Learning Disabilities Association of America, 1993; National Association of State Boards of Education, 1992). These very perspectives can become a formidable barrier to widespread, successful outcomes in the implementation of inclusion. That is, many educators are making significant programming changes based on philosophical arguments about inclusion without having given adequate prior thought to what their own philosophy really is, what it means, or how to go about translating it into practice.

For example, the relatively straightforward question, "What does inclusion mean?" is unavoidably entangled within a plethora of larger, philosophical questions such as these suggested by participants of the CCBD Working Forum on Inclusion:

- "Why can't all children and youth be successfully educated together instead of having separate and parallel systems of education?"
- "Why can't all children and youth be treated the same way by all people?"
- "What is the most appropriate way for education to meet the diverse needs of all students?"

Answers to such questions are neither easily forthcoming nor separable from the personal interests, experiences, and emotions each individual brings to the discussion. Thus, in defining inclusion we are immediately presented with a philosophical problem. According to Berlin (1956),

> Philosophical problems arise when men ask questions of themselves or of others which, though very diverse, have certain characteristics in common. These questions tend to be very general, to involve issues of principle, and to have little or no concern with practical utility. But what is even more characteristic of them is that there seem to be no obvious and generally accepted procedures for answering them, nor any class of specialists to whom we automatically turn to answers. (p. 11)

For the most part, Berlin's comments have obvious relevance to the issue of inclusion. Clearly, it can be seen that the questions just posed involve general principles, are relatively diverse, and at the same time share a common concern about the education of children. And while the field of special education may be struggling somewhat in its well-intentioned desire to develop a suitable procedure for solving the potential problems created by inclusion (the CCBD Forum is an excellent example of that desire), it may be possible to make use of inclusion's inherent philosophical nature for the overall benefit of the education reform movement.

One way to proceed is to formulate all responses to calls for inclusive reform in a manner consistent with New Age Enlightenment perspectives. For example, teachers can begin simply by asking fundamentally different questions–questions that are more relevant and based on empirical processes and an appropriate level of scientific skepticism. Herbert Goldstein (1984) presented a wonderfully relevant illustration of how this process can work, in his description of an attempt to convince educators about the efficacy of early special classes for students with mental retardation:

> The issue of the effectiveness of educational programs for these children was under continuous examination. ... Arguments supporting special classes based on opinion, morality, decency, and logic were quickly devastated by the simple question: Where is the evidence? This sent everyone digging for studies and analyzing their results. ... Initially, the evidence was overwhelmingly in favor of dropping special classes until we dissected the research design. Then it became clear that serious flaws in the research methods rendered these studies little more than intellectual exercises. (p. 81)

Goldstein's example of modern enlightened thinking occurred almost 30 years ago (Goldstein, Moss, & Jordan, 1965). Yet it offers sensible advice to those of us currently choosing sides in the inclusion debate. In response to the claims and accusations already being made by both advocates and opponents of inclusion we all should be asking, first and foremost, "Where is the evidence?" The answer is that the evidence is there, but it is being largely ignored. Researchers and practitioners should be able to extract a wealth of valuable information from the accumulated literature on mainstreaming, integration, the regular education initiative (REI), teacher attitudes, and other related areas. Information derived from various sources can be used to help operationalize the types of questions enlightened educators need to ask in order to ensure answers that are more easily attainable, and more importantly, are of practical value to the education of students with disabilities.

Once the empirical evidence has been examined, it is possible to begin asking fundamentally relevant questions, such as,

- "For which categories of exceptionality does inclusion work, and for which, if any, does it not?"

- "What specific curricular modifications must be made in order to ensure success?"
- "What characteristics of regular educators and administrators are associated with successful inclusion settings?"
- "What kind of, and how much, teacher training is necessary or adequate to prepare teachers to be successful recipients of included students?"

Each of these questions, too, was asked by the professional educators who attended the Working Forum. However, without having previously established a personal philosophy of Enlightenment to guide one's thoughts and actions, without having examined the evidence and weighed its relevance against knowledge- and reality-based factors in each individual's school setting or the like, participants found it difficult to agree on specific answers to these questions.

Nevertheless, the CCBD Forum was a positive first step in becoming more enlightened about the complexities of the inclusion issue: It offered professional educators the opportunity to share similar concerns and to discuss possible solutions to perceived problems. The next step should move toward putting these philosophical discussions to action. Then, when educators are able to agree on acceptable, empirically validated answers to these kinds of questions, it will be many times easier to unravel the overriding dilemma, "What does inclusion really mean?"

In concluding this part of the discussion, let me say that the philosophical foundation of the inclusion issue does not preclude those involved in it from attempting to define it. Several definitions of inclusion, including variants such as full inclusion and responsible inclusion, have been developed by educational organizations with a vested interest in the outcome of school reform efforts. For example, both the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (O'Neil, 1993) and Phi Delta Kappa (Rogers, 1993) have produced reports focused on inclusion and/or full inclusion, and the University of Kansas Center for Research in Learning has disseminated a document in which the concept of *responsible inclusion* is defined and elaborated upon (SIM Training Network, 1993). Here, it is enough to say that a philosophical concept such as inclusion might be defined in terms adequate to small groups of users, but a broad, universally acceptable meaning of inclusion may simply not be possible without a commitment by all educators to an enlightened approach toward fully understanding this challenging issue.

Defining Plans to Ensure Appropriate Services to Students with E/BD within Inclusive Environments

In a New Age of Enlightenment in public education, two new focal points of action are necessary. The first, a focus on learning from and improving upon the past, as in most areas involving social change, has been generally neglected in the inclusion debate. Fortunately, and perhaps out of necessity rather than foresight, the second emphasis has already come into play in many areas. This focus requires recognition that in order for inclusion to succeed it must be a grass-roots effort, resulting in individualized inclusion programs, if not for every school, then for each microcommunity. It is likely that a master inclusion plan mandated by federal or state authority will have a difficult time passing the muster of universal social validity.

The importance of attending to historical knowledge is nowhere as important as in the development and definition of special education service delivery plans. Although some have insisted that inclusion is far removed from topics such as mainstreaming and integration (e.g., Rogers, 1993), I believe that similarities to traditional special education goals and strategies are undeniable. Before proposing "new" directions and broad, sweeping changes, an awareness of previous programming efforts and rationales should be analyzed as a way to avoid duplicating errors of judgment and reinstituting failed programs.

Pioneers in the field of special education have previously addressed inclusion issues. In introspective essays about the development of special education, Samuel Kirk, Herbert Goldstein, and William Morse related their observations relevant to this discussion. Although the terminology may be different (e.g., they use the word mainstreaming versus inclusion), the issues they addressed are identical to those that surround the inclusion movement. For example, Kirk (1984) reminds us that "the enthusiastic advocates for mainstreaming tended to disregard certain facts" (p. 47), most notably that mainstreaming is not a new idea in education and that it has been regularly practiced since the advent of "sight-saving" classes in 1913. Goldstein (1984) echoes, "the fact is, children have always been mainstreamed where the conditions permitted, and competent teachers have always planned for each of their students" (p. 94). Finally, Morse eloquently warns zealots of integration to heed the lessons learned about previous efforts to include students with E/BD (Morse, 1984). Interestingly, in an essay written a decade ago, Morse accurately predicted the dawning of the age of inclusion.

Again, educators need to take a look at the empirical evidence and use it to help judge the likelihood of success of new programming strategies for serving children and youth with E/BD. Many of these plans will hold up to such scrutiny and deserve to be fully developed, implemented, and evaluated. At the CCBD Working Forum on Inclusion, two noteworthy ideas were introduced and met with a favorable response from the participants of my discussion group.

The first involved investigating the strategies employed in the collaborative mental health movement

as a potential inclusion model for special education. The ties between mental health agencies and public schools in serving the needs of students with E/BD make this idea especially appealing. The second plan endorses a "wrap-around" model, which focuses on reframing individual student problems as strengths and providing whatever services are necessary to build upon those strengths. According to supporters of the wrap-around model, when focusing on strengths educators are less likely to fall into the mode of determining specific placement settings, and more likely to focus on individualized planning (Lucille Eber, personal communication, October 1, 1993).

Moving Toward Ideal Educational Placements for Students with E/BD: Overcoming Obstacles, Barriers, and Inhibitors to Obtaining the Ideal

The obstacles, barriers, and inhibitors to successful inclusion identified by participants of the CCBD Working Forum on Inclusion included three primary factors: (a) the reluctance of educators to part with traditional ways of educating, (b) a lack of training and expertise by regular educators in how to deal with students with E/BD, and (c) negative teacher and administrator attitudes about students with E/BD. In this paper I have tried to outline a philosophical approach, referred to as a New Age of Enlightenment, which can help guide the thoughts, opinions, and actions of educators and researchers in addressing these and other factors.

The ascent of a New Age of Enlightenment in public education, emphasizing the same ideals and principles heralded by the 18th century philosophers–reason, knowledge, and empiricism–will be necessary if inclusion is to be successfully incorporated into current systems of service delivery for students with disabilities. Ultimately, this is no easy task. Addressing classical Enlightenment, Porter (1990) observed, "relations between principles and practice, attitudes and actions are always complex" (p. 68). Clearly, this truism will continue to hinder efforts to appropriately address critical issues of educational reform. Yet, the New Age of Enlightenment is an optimistic philosophy.

It is appropriate, in conclusion, to apply Porter's (1990) observations of the Enlightenment to the general theme of this essay. What is beyond dispute, Porter says, is that the original promoters of Enlightenment values believed that improvements to human life were possible and desirable, and although progress was not inevitable, it was at least within humanity's grasp. So, too, must 21st century educators believe that it is their duty to adopt a personal philosophy that results in reasonable, knowledgeable, and empirical actions to improve the lives of all students with disabilities.

References

Anchor, R. (1967). *The enlightenment tradition*. New York: Harper & Row.

Berlin, I. (1956). *The age of enlightenment: The 18th century philosophers*. New York: Mentor Books.

Council for Exceptional Children. (1993). CEC policy on inclusive schools and community settings. Supplement to *Teaching Exceptional Children, 25*(4).

Goldstein, H. (1984). A search for understanding. In B. Blatt & R.J. Morris (Eds.), *Perspectives in special education: Personal orientations* (pp. 56-100). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Goldstein, H., Moss, J., & Jordan, L.J. (1965). *The efficacy of special class training in the development of mentally retarded children*. (Cooperative Research Project No. 169). Washington, DC: U.S. Office of Education.

Kirk, S.A. (1984). Introspection and prophecy. In B. Blatt & R.J. Morris (Eds.), *Perspectives in special education: Personal orientations* (pp. 25-55). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Learning Disabilities Association of America. (1993). Position paper on full inclusion of all students with learning disabilities in the regular education classroom. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 26*(9), 594.

Morse, W.C. (1984). Personal perspective. In B. Blatt & R.J. Morris (Eds.), *Perspectives in special education: Personal orientations* (pp. 101-124). Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

National Association of State Boards of Education. (1992). *Winners all: A call for inclusive schools*. Alexandria, VA: Author.

O'Neil, J. (1993, November). 'Inclusive' education gains adherents. *Update, 35*(9), pp. 1, 3-4.

Porter, R. (1990). *The enlightenment*. Atlantic Highland, NJ: Humanities Press International.

Rogers, J. (1993). *The inclusion revolution*. (Research Bulletin No. 11). Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa, Center for Evaluation, Development, and Research.

SIM Training Network. (1993, February). Responsible inclusion: A new vision. *Statenotes, 1*(5), pp. 1-2.